

MEDICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOV 9 1929

VOLUME XXIV

NUMBER 4

October 1929

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

PAUL SHOREY, *Managing Editor*

CHARLES HENRY HERSKOW
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER
CARL DARLING BUCK

GORDON JENNINGS LAING
HENRY W. PRESCOTT

GERTRUDE SMITH
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRELL, *University of Chicago*

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER, *University of Chicago*
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
CHARLES FORSTER SMITH, *University of Wisconsin*
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*

VOL. XXIV

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER 1929

No. 4

P. Mich. 620: A Series of Arithmetical Problems	By Frank Eggleston Robbins	321
The Quotations from Homer in Polynianus I. Proem. 4-12	By G. M. Bolling	330
Ithacan Origins	By A. Shewan	335
The So-Called Fragment of Hippolytus, <i>περὶ ἄδου</i>	By Harold Cherniss	346
Notes on the Constitutional Inscription from Cyrene	By Jakob A. O. Larsen	351
The Logic and Language of the <i>Hippias Major</i>	By G. M. A. Grube	369
Some Notes on the <i>Agricola</i> of Tacitus	By Mignonette Spilman	376
On Apuleius <i>Metamorphoses</i> I. 14-17	By B. E. Perry	394
Notes and Discussions		401
PAUL SHOREY: For the Record.—SHARON LEA PINCH: The Name "Marcus Antonius" in <i>CIL</i> , Volume VI.—WILLIAM ROLLO: The Date and Authorship of the <i>Favignium Vesteris</i> .—PAUL SHOREY: Plato and the Stoic <i>Chorists</i> in the Berlin <i>Telestiche</i> Commentary.		
Book Reviews		411
REITERHEIM: <i>Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe</i> (Heidel).—HARTWELL: <i>Locustianus and Milton</i> (Stevens).—SACHAU: <i>Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique</i> (Mylonas).—HARLAND: <i>Historia Alpina. A History of the Island in the Bronze Age</i> (Mylonas).—EAST: <i>The Way of the Greeks</i> (Shorey).—MÜHL: <i>Die Gesetze des Zaleukos und Charondas</i> (Smith).—COLLART: <i>Les Papyrus Bourbiers</i> (Boak).—WINTERMANN AND KRAEMER (Eds. and Trs.): <i>Greek Papyri in the Library of Cornell University</i> (Boak).—BRADSHAW: <i>The Negro in Greek and Roman Civilization. A Study of the Ethiopian Type</i> (Mylonas).—WEINREICH: <i>Studien zu Martial</i> (Nixon).—JOURNET, COLLART, AND LESQUIER (Eds.): <i>Papyrus Grecs de Lille</i> (Boak).—OLASON: <i>Papyrusbriefe aus der frühesten Römerszeit</i> (Boak).—ROBERTSON: <i>The Future of Greek Studies. An Inaugural Lecture</i> (Shorey).—FARRINGTON: <i>Samuel Butler and the "Odyssey"</i> (Shorey).		

Index to Volume XXIV

427

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5730 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. (The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.00. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Dominican Republic, Canary Islands, El Salvador, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hayti, Uruguay, Paraguay, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Siam, Siam Islands, Balearic Islands, Spain, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.04); for all other countries in the Postal Union 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.06). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 100 Brook Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, £1 1s. 6d. each; single copies, including postage, 6s. 3d. each.

For Japan: THE MARUBENI COMPANY, LTD., Tokyo.

For China: THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD., Freeman Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.00, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents. Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

7

4

21

30

35

46

51

69

76

94

101

11

11

27

y of
cart
aba,
na,
may,
ged
ute
ies,
stal

osa,
tud-

ies,
nte,
ub-
ock

re of

2
d on

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXIV

OCTOBER 1929

Number 4

P. MICH. 620: A SERIES OF ARITHMETICAL PROBLEMS¹

BY FRANK EGGLESTON ROBBINS

THE papyrus which is numbered 620 in the collection of the University of Michigan should be of no small interest to the historian of mathematics, for it appears to be a fragment of a collection of arithmetical problems, written prior to the time of Diophantus, in which a quasi-algebraic method of solution is employed and in which appear some of the symbols used in the manuscripts of Diophantus, notably the sign ζ , which denotes the unknown term.

It is not known from what part of Egypt P. Mich. 620 came, but it is undoubtedly Egyptian, and was one of the purchases made in 1921 by the late Professor Francis W. Kelsey. Paleographically it seems to belong early in the second century after Christ; perhaps it may be even earlier. The writing is of the literary type but rather irregular.² There is no indication in the papyrus who its author may have been.

The fragment³ is an irregularly oblong piece about 210 millimeters

¹ I desire to acknowledge gratefully the many valuable suggestions generously given me by Sir Thomas L. Heath; Professor A. S. Hunt, of Queen's College, Oxford; and Professor J. G. Smyly, of Trinity College, Dublin.

² ϵ is always ϵ ; ν is tall and of the form γ (but not consistently; the usual uncial form also is found); η is usually the ordinary uncial, but once (as a numeral) like the ν first mentioned. ϕ is the tallest letter both above and below the line; ρ sometimes but not always has a long tail. β is sometimes well formed and sometimes could easily be mistaken for δ .

³ The reverse contains part of what is apparently a list of names in a later, coarser hand.

broad and 125 millimeters from top to bottom in its longest dimensions. The top margin is preserved, and likewise a margin at the left, but the bottom is irregularly broken, and probably the original roll was twice as high as what is now left. The writing on the obverse is in two columns; of column 1, on the left, the full length of the line, about 130 millimeters, is preserved, and of column 2 perhaps a trifle more than the left-hand half, as the lines are only about 70 millimeters long. Because many numerals occur in the text the number of letters in the lines varies widely, from 36 to 50, or even more; in most lines, however, there are between 40 and 45 letters or symbols.

These two columns contain parts of three mathematical problems, together with the ciphering that goes with them. Column 1 preserves somewhat more than the last third of the first problem, with calculations; after which, in the part now lost, came the beginning of the second problem. Column 2 contains, first, five lines of text, which end this second problem; then the calculations pertaining to it; and, finally, a half-dozen lines, the last of which are much broken, from the beginning of a third problem. The calculations are neat columns of figures arranged on one or both sides of vertical lines; horizontal lines across the page above and below them separate them from the text.

The numerical notation shows no unusual features. The letters denoting numbers are sometimes distinguished from the others by horizontal straight lines above them, less frequently by an accent mark to the right,¹ or by a curve like a circumflex, above; but most often no mark at all is used upon numbers less than the thousands. The thousands ordinarily have some stroke of the letter extended high above the line, and at the top there is a curved cross-stroke resembling either a circumflex or a breve, according to the way it is curved. A similar type of notation is used in *Papiri greci e latini*, Volume III, No. 250, and in P. Mich. 621, which was published in *Classical Philology*, XVIII (1923), 328-33.

A few symbols are used. As in other papyri, an oblique line, /, occurs frequently in both columns in the sense of *γίγνεται*; i.e., it is practically equivalent to the sign of equality in modern mathematics. μ , which is found only in the calculations occupying lines 6-9 of

¹ Generally showing that the numeral is used as a fraction.

column 2, is more unusual and less certain as to its meaning. In P. Mich. 1, an astrological treatise,¹ it is an abbreviation for $\mu\omicron\iota\rho\alpha$, "degree," but such a meaning will not suit in this case, even though the number 180, which is suggestive, is involved in the problem. I am indebted to Sir Thomas Heath for the suggestion that μ stands here for $\mu\nu\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$, as it sometimes does in the manuscripts of Diophantus.² This seems to be the most probable explanation.

The most interesting symbol used in this document is that already mentioned, ς . It might be thought to be the sign for $\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\acute{\eta}$, which is so common in the papyri, but this is impossible as abstract numbers and not sums of money are the subject here. Neither can it be the numerical sign for 6, which it closely resembles; for in no instance will 6 fit the context. It must be, as Sir Thomas Heath again suggests, the symbol, supposedly an abbreviation of $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\theta\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, which is used in certain manuscripts, notably those of Diophantus, either in its original sense of "number," "quantity," or like the x of our algebra to designate the unknown term.³ It will bear both these meanings in our papyrus. In the text of column 1, where it is followed by τ , 300, in several instances, and once by χ , 600, it is best to render "the quantity 300" or "the quantity 600"; in fact, in translation the sign may be utterly disregarded without doing violence to the sense. In column 1, line 12, however, in the calculations, it seems to correspond to the algebraic x , as it probably does also in the calculations in column 2, lines 6-9.

In the text of the papyrus which follows, the usual conventions as to dots and brackets are followed. For convenience, words are separated, but no accents are added. The markings (or absence of markings) of numerals represent as exactly as possible what is contained in the text itself, except that thousands are indicated by capital letters instead of the rather complicated extensions and flourishes described above.

¹ *Classical Philology*, XXII (1927), 27.

² *Greek Mathematics*, II, 459-60.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 456-57. Tannery's edition of Diophantus (Leipzig, 1893) uses the symbol *passim*.

COLUMN 1

- παλιν τας $\overline{\rho\nu}$. . . ι το . του τεταρτου [α]ριθμου . . . [Δ]φ και
 αι εν [τ]η υποστασει αυτου Σχ' / Ερ τοσούτων ο τέ[τ]αρτος ει-
 τα συνθες του[ς δ] Αν και Ασ και Βφν και Ερ / Θ[τ]
 α[πο]δείξεις επει λεγει ο δευτερος υπερεχ[ε]τω τ[ο]υ πρωτου μερει
 5 ζ' λαβε το ζ' των του πρωτου Αν / ρν τ[ο]υτο συνθε[ς]
 [και] Αν / Ασ οσων ο δευτερος παλιν επει λεγ[ει] ο τριτος
 υπερεχετω των δυο Στ συνθες τον $\bar{\alpha}$ και $[\bar{\beta} /]$ Βσν και τας
 της υπεροχης Στ συνθες / Βφν ο[σων] ο τριτος και επει λε-
 γει ο τεταρτος υπερεχετω των $\bar{\gamma}$ Στ συνθες τους τρεις / Δω
 10 και της υπεροχης Στ / Ερ οσων ο τεταρτος

	ζ'	[Σ]τ	Στ	ΣΘτ
Σξ	Ση	Σιε Στ	[Σ]λ Σχ	
Αν	Ασ	Βφν	[Ερ].	
ρν				

COLUMN 2

- εστιν ο [δευ]τερος του πρωτου τε[τραπλσιος ποιησον¹]
 μειζω τετρακι τας $\mu\beta$ / ρξη [και τας της υπεροχης $\iota\beta$ / $\rho\pi^2$]
 τοσούτων ο δευτερος αποδειξεις [λαβε το ζ' του δευτερου³]
 / λ αλλα και $\iota\beta$ / $\mu\beta$ οσων ο πρωτο[ς] και τας $\mu\beta$ ποιησον τετρα-
 5 κι / ρξη αλλα και $\iota\beta$ / $\rho\pi$ ο[σων] ο δευτερος]

ζ'	$\mu \iota\beta$	$\bar{\delta} \mu \iota\beta$	
Σα		Σδ $\mu \iota\beta$	
γ' $\mu \iota\delta$		$\bar{\beta} \mu \iota\beta$ / $\beta \mu$ [. . .	
α $\mu\beta$	ρξη $\iota\beta$	/ ρπ	

- 10 Χ αριθμοι $\bar{\gamma}$ οι $\bar{\gamma}$ Ετ και εστω[σαν ο πρωτος και ο δευτερος]
 του τριτου τετρακαιεικοσαπλαιο[ι και εστω ο $\bar{\beta}$ αν-]
 τος του π[ρ]ωτου πεντα[π]λοι ευρ[ε]τοι οι τρεις αριθμοι . . .]
 . . . ως επ[ει] ο πρωτος κα[ι] ο δευτ[ε]ρος του τριτου τετρακαιε-
 [κοσαπλ]αιοι οι τρεις αρα εικοσι[ι]πενταπλαιοι του $\bar{\gamma}$ μερ-
 [ισον Ετ εις⁴ τ]ας κξ / σιβ το[σ]ουτων ο τριτος]
 [.] [.]

¹ Cf. Diophantus iv. 33 (p. 276, l. 5 [Tannery]): και ποιῶ ζ' τοὺς δύο ἀριθμούς.

² Cf. col. 1, ll. 7-8, 10.

³ Cf. col. 1, l. 5.

⁴ For μερίζειν c. εις or παρά cf. Tannery's *Index graecitatis* in his edition of *Diophantus*, II, 275; also in the Akhmim papyrus, problems 27, 28.

The first problem seems to have been stated somewhat as follows:

There are four numbers, the sum of which is 9,900; let the second exceed the first by one-seventh of the first; let the third exceed the sum of the first two by 300, and let the fourth exceed the sum of the first three by 300; find the numbers.

Much of this is actually quoted, in column 1, lines 4, 6, and 8-9; also column 2, lines 10-12, which is the statement of the conditions of the third problem, may be compared, so that there can be little doubt even of the actual wording of the hypothesis.

Each problem, apparently, falls into three parts: first, the statement of conditions, or hypothesis; second, the solution; and, finally, the check, introduced by the word ἀπὸδείξις (col. 1, l. 4; col. 2, l. 3). We have parts of the last two divisions of the first and second problems, and of the first and second parts of the third. Unfortunately, the solution is not fully preserved in any one of the three.

The method of working out the first problem would be entirely obscure if the calculations of column 1, lines 11-14, were not preserved. If A , B , C , and D represent the four numbers, we then have, by the terms of the problem,

$$A+B+C+D=9,900, \quad (1)$$

$$B=\frac{8}{7}A, \quad (2)$$

$$C=A+B+300=\frac{15}{7}A+300, \quad (3)$$

$$D=A+B+C+300=\frac{30}{7}A+600. \quad (4)$$

Probably one-seventh of A was taken as the unknown, x , or in this notation ζ . This appears from line 12, where there is the series $7x$, $8x$, $15x+300$, and $30x+600$, which are precisely the values of A , B , C , and D , according to the equations above, if $x=\frac{A}{7}$. If these values are

substituted in (1), we have $60x+900=9,900$; hence $x=150$, and A , B , C , and D can easily be found. That this obvious way of solution was used there can be little doubt, particularly as something very similar appears in the third problem. Lines 1-2 are concerned with the last step of the solution, the discovery of the value of D . The first line is obscure, but (with l. 2) probably was somewhat to this effect:

[To get the value] of the fourth number, again [take] 150 thirty times; it gives 4,500; and the 600 in its assigned value [i.e., according to the conditions of the problem]¹ make 5,100; this is the fourth number. Add the four numbers: $1,050 + 1,200 + 2,550 + 5,100 = 9,900$ [l. 3].

Lines 4–10 present no difficulties:

Check: Since it says, "Let the second number exceed the first by one-seventh (of the first)," take one-seventh of the first, 1,050; it is 150; add this and 1,050; this gives 1,200, which is the second number. Again, since it says, "Let the third exceed the [first] two by 300," add the first and second; it gives 2,250; and add the 300 of the excess; it gives 2,550, which is the third. And since it says, "Let the fourth exceed the [first] three by 300," add the three; it gives 4,800; and the 300 of the excess; this makes 5,100, which is the fourth number.

The use of the feminine article in this passage² is peculiar and calls for comment. It probably is to be explained by understanding *μονάδες* in these phrases.

The calculations at the bottom of the column, in our notation and omitting brackets, are:

LINE 11:	$\frac{1}{7}$		300	300	9,900
	$7x$	$8x$	$15x + 300$	$30x + 600$	
	1,050	= 1,200	2,550	5,100	
	150				

The symbol ζ in line 12, as has already been remarked, is used like our algebraic x , but in line 11 its original meaning, "number" or "quantity," seems to be uppermost.

The portion of the second problem which is preserved in column 2, lines 1–5, may be thus rendered:

[Since] the second number is four times the first, multiply 4×42 ; it gives 168; and add the 12 of the excess, which gives 180; this is the second number.

Check: One-sixth of the second number is 30; but add 12; it gives 42, which is the first number; and take 42 four times, which is 168; then add 12; it gives 180, which is the second number.

The fact that the derivation of the second number is the last step in the solution, and is followed immediately by the customary third

¹ *ὑποστάσις* is a word commonly used by Diophantus. Tannery translates it *positio*, and defines it in his *Index graecitatis* as *numeri quaesiti valor vel numericus vel expressus in x* (op cit., II, 285). The usage is similar here.

² *τὰς πν*, 1; *αἱ ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει*, 2; *τὰς τῆς ὑπεροχῆς*, 7–8; cf. also *τοσοῦτων* and *δσων*, *passim*, in both columns, and in col. 2 *τὰς μβ*, 2; *τὰς κε*, 15.

and final division of these problems, the check, shows clearly that only two unknowns are involved. Apparently it was stated, in the hypothesis, that of two unknown numbers the first is one-sixth of the second, plus 12, and the second four times the first, plus 12. How the problem was solved is not clear, but the columns of figures offer some help. They are, in our notation:

$$\begin{array}{r|l} \frac{1}{6} & [+12 \\ x & \\ \hline 3 & [=] 14 \\ 42 & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{r|l} 4 & 12 \\ 4x & [+12 \\ \hline 2 & [\times] 42 \\ 168 & [+12 \\ \hline & = 180 \end{array} \dots$$

The first column evidently relates to the solution for the first number (which we may call A), and the second to the discovery of B , the second number. The two equations, as we might express them, would be

$$A = \frac{B}{6} + 12, \quad (1)$$

$$B = 4A + 12. \quad (2)$$

Our author, in working out his problem, manages to introduce the term 14 into the calculations. This suggests that possibly, having a value for $\frac{B}{6}$ in (1), he, so to speak, made this the unknown term of the problem and secured a second value for it by dividing equation (2) by 6:

$$\frac{B}{6} = \frac{4A}{6} + 2, \quad (3)$$

or

$$\frac{B}{6} = \frac{2A}{3} + 2.$$

By substituting this value¹ of $\frac{B}{6}$ in (1) it is straightway seen that $\frac{1}{3}A =$

14. Perhaps this explains the occurrence of 14 in the left-hand column. The top line of this column is undoubtedly nothing but the statement in figures that one-sixth of the second number, plus 12, is the first number, and similarly in the second column, second line, we must have, in numerical form, an expression for four times the first number, plus 12, which, according to the hypothesis, was the value of the second number. Then in the third line the numerical value of A is

¹ Or, of course, by adding the equations; but I doubt whether so early a mathematician would do that.

introduced, but the right-hand side of this line is mutilated. The fourth line simply puts equation (2), above, into figures.

The fourth problem¹ reads as follows:

Three numbers. The [sum of the] three is 5,300. Let the [sum of the] first and the second be 24 times the third, and let the second be 5 times the first. To find the three numbers. [Inasmuch as] the first and the second are 24 times the third, therefore the [sum of the] three is 25 times the third. Divide 5,300 by 25 and it gives 212, which is the third number. . . .

The restoration of line 11 which has been adopted was chosen because, given the two conditions that $A+B+C$ (the three numbers) = 5,300 and $A+B=24C$, which seem quite certain, $B=5A$ is the only possible simple combination which will give a solution in integers. With this reading, A will be 848; B , 4,240; and C , 212. If, however, line 11 be restored [καὶ ἔστωσαν ὁ δεύτερος καὶ ὁ τρί]τος, κτλ., which is tempting, the solution will be $A=883\frac{1}{3}$, $B=4,204\frac{2}{3}$, and $C=212$. Diophantus, to be sure, deals freely with fractions, but the other two problems in this papyrus confine themselves strictly to integers. In my opinion, the rather awkward αὐτός is preferable to a fractional solution.

It will be noted that however the passage is restored the value of the third number will in any case be 212, since it is fully determined by the first two equations; also the method of solution for the third unknown is similar to that already seen in the first problem.

Furthermore, it is to be observed that if the rejected reading of line 11 be adopted, the problem becomes identical with Diophantus *Arith.* i. 20,² which is thus stated: τὸν ἐπιταχθέντα ἀριθμὸν διελεῖν εἰς τρεῖς ἀριθμοὺς ὅπως ἐκάτερος τῶν ἁκρων προσλαβὼν τὸν μέσον πρὸς τὸν λοιπὸν τῶν ἁκρων λόγον ἔχῃ δεδομένον. In any case the similarity of these problems to some of those in the first book of Diophantus' *Arithmetica* is noticeable, and the fact that they also exhibit an approach to algebraic methods is most notable of all.

Diophantus, as the quotation from i. 20 shows, begins his problems by stating them in the most general terms and thereafter fixes the values with which the student is to work. Our papyrus is unlike

¹ The symbol in the margin probably is merely to indicate the beginning of a new paragraph.

² This has been pointed out by Professor J. G. Smyly, of Trinity College, Dublin.

Diophantus in the first respect, but like him in dealing with abstract numbers alone, and not with measures of grain, the division of estates, and similar things, such as are the subject of so many of the problems in the well-known Akhmim papyrus;¹ neither is it, like this latter, concerned with fractions, least common multiples, and greatest common divisors. Thus it is neither definitely utilitarian, nor so scientifically generalized as the *Arithmetica* of Diophantus; yet it is most probably a schoolbook of some sort, and perhaps from it or others like it Diophantus may have derived ideas which served as a basis for his mathematical methods.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

¹J. Baillet, *Le papyrus mathématique d'Akhmim*, "Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire," IX, 1.

THE QUOTATIONS FROM HOMER IN POLYAINOS

1. PROEM. 4-12

By G. M. BOLLING

ACCORDING to Melber's Index, there is but one quotation from Homer in the whole of Polyainos outside of the two pages indicated above; and, as Professor Dorjahn, who has recently written upon the subject,¹ apparently knows no others, the completeness of the Index may be assumed.

These two pages, with their allusions to many scenes of the *Odyssey* and their quotation of thirteen heroic hexameters, form then a section that contrasts like a *purpureus pannus* with the rest of the work. It is sharply marked off, closing with the transition:

ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἢ ὅσα τοιαῦτα διδάσκων Ὅμηρος ἀρκεῖτω. οἶον δὲ κάκεῖνο στρατήγημα Ὀδυσσεύς οἱ τραγῶδοι ᾄδουσιν.

Its purpose is to show that the use of *στρατηγήματα* can be traced back to Homer, and it is thus a segment of the Stoic doctrine that all the arts and sciences have their roots in Homer.² To prove the point all the quotations must consequently come from Homer, which meant for Polyainos, and for generations before him, from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and from no other poem of the cycle.³ No good printer's ink need be wasted in arguing that.

The real problem is from what text of Homer the quotations were taken. The material is so scanty that it can lead definitely only to negative conclusions. For obvious chronological reasons Polyainos cannot have used Wolf's edition—which is what is meant by such phrases as "the text that we have"; nor do the quotations come from the *a*-text,⁴ that is, from the vulgate papyri text which later on be-

¹ *Classical Journal*, XXIV (1929), 530. No more need here be said of this article than that I am indebted to it for the turning of my attention to a minor problem which is not without interest.

² Christ-Schmid, *Gesch. d. gr. Litt.*³, II, 590, point out that it was meant to please the Stoic emperors to whom the book is dedicated.

³ Cf. Bethe, *Homer*, II, 203.

⁴ For this term cf. my "Zur hom. Textueberlieferung," *Phil. Woch.*, XLVIII (Aug. 18, 1928), Sp. 1014-21, and the earlier works there cited.

[*Classical Philology*, XXIV, October, 1929]

comes the core of the Wolfian text. This as the text current in Polyainos' day, and for centuries before and after him, would be the natural expectation; but it is contradicted by the presence, even in this small number of quotations, of three "plus verses." These are:

1. *ἡ δόλω ἡὲ βίηφι, ἡ ἀμφιδὸν ἡὲ κρυφῆδόν.*—The verse is known from its use in an apophthegm¹ by Antigonos; it is preserved by Zenobios (i. 93) and, with a metrically better variant *βίη*, by Stobaeus (*Flor.* liv. 46). It is explicitly attributed by Zenobios to *ὁ ποιήτης*, and after Harmon's sound and sparkling article,² there can be no doubt about what is meant by that term. It is said in Polyainos that the verse is used frequently in Homer, and there is no reason to question the statement. Only the first half of the verse is quoted, and this tempted Melber to identify it with the close of ι 406, where only *δόλω ἡὲ βίηφι* stands. As "plus verses" are frequently made up from phrases found elsewhere, there is nothing surprising about such a partial coincidence. The other half of the verse came from ξ 330, τ 299.

2. *σῆ δ' ἦλω βουλῇ Πριάμου πόλις εὐρύαγυια.*—The verse is known to us only as χ 230 where it is put in the mouth of Athena-Mentor. Polyainos cites it in support of the assertion *οἱ δ' ἥρωες καὶ τὴν νίκην αὐτῷ* [sc. 'Οδυσσεῖ] *ἀνῆψαν*, thus showing that it must have stood, or also stood, as a "plus verse" elsewhere in the text from which these quotations come. The omission of the line from Melber's Index may therefore be intentional.

3. Immediately after the passage just quoted Polyainos continues:

*καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ ἄλλοι πάλιν αὖ μαρτυροῦσιν ἄλῶναι τὸ Ἴλιον Ὀδυσσέως
βουλῇ καὶ μίθοισι καὶ ἡπεροπηίδι τέχνῃ,*

clearly meaning that elsewhere in the *Odyssey* other characters than the *ἥρωες* testify to the success of Odysseus' cunning. The line is known from an apophthegm of Alexander's;³ and is twice quoted by Strabo (i. 2. 4 [p. 17C]; xiii. 1. 41 [p. 601C]), each time along with quotations taken only from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. There can be no doubt that Strabo or his source found it in his text of the *Odyssey*. As before, the "plus verse" includes a phrase that recurs in Δ 323, ν 298, π 420.

¹ Cf. Teufer, *De Hom. in Apophth. usurpato*, (Leipsic, 1890) p. 43; Leutsch, *Paroem. Gr.*, I, 30.

² *Classical Philology*, XVIII (1923), 35-47.

³ Stobaeus *Flor.* liv. 48; cf. Teufer, *loc. cit.*

Clearly then the quotations in Polyainos come from a text in which there was a fairly large¹ number of "plus verses," that is, of verses which are not to be found in the *a*-text nor in Wolf's edition. If one seeks to locate this text more precisely there seem to be two possibilities: (1) The *a*-text is Alexandrian, and one way the Pergamene text differed from it was in the presence of "plus verses."² It is possible that a Pergamene text was used by Polyainos. (2) The section has been cribbed, quotations and all, from a much earlier writer, who quoted from a text such as we glimpse in the fourth century B.C. from some quotations, and see somewhat better in the third and early second century—thanks to the "wild" Ptolemaic papyri. The reproduction of such texts stops about 150 B.C. so that this date may be taken as a *terminus ante quem*.

The latter seems the more probable alternative; and, if so, it is likely that the ultimate source will be Chrysippus. Professor Oldfather believes that he can show³ that Epictetus "got practically his entire apparatus of literary examples from Chrysippus," and this somewhat kindred problem may be allowed to rest pending Professor Oldfather's discussion of the larger question.

Aelian offers a sharp contrast.

With the help of Hercher's indexes I have been able to turn up the following pertinent material.⁴ Quotations are made of or from the following lines: A 82-83, *NA* vii. 23; B 480-81, *NA* xi. 10; 581, *NA* xvii. 6; Γ 373, *NA* x. 1; Δ 101 (= 119), *NA* x. 26; E 83 (= II 334, T 477), *NA* xvi. 1; I 404-5, *VH* vi. 9; Λ 124, *NA* xiv. 8; 172-73, *NA* v. 39; 416, *NA* v. 45; M 49-54, *NA* vi. 6; O 237-38, *NA* x. 14; II 407, *NA* viii. 28; Σ 484, *NA* v. 39; T 131, *NA* xi. 17; 221, 223, *NA* iv. 6; Φ 577, *NA* xvii. 43; Ψ 280-82, *NA* xvi. 24 // α 261-62, *NA* v. 16; γ 196, *NA* iv. 45; δ 96, *Fr.* 83; ζ 104, *NA* iii. 27; θ 492, *NA* xi. 11; κ 510, *NA* iv. 23; μ 394, *NA* xi. 19; ν 409-10, *NA* v. 45; ξ 15, 533, *NA* v. 45; ο 321-

¹ The material is too slight to serve as the basis for any mathematical calculations. Otherwise, I might refer to the figures for Ptolemaic papyri given in my *External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford, 1925), p. 45.

² *External Evidence*, Index I, s.v. "Pergamene."

³ *Classical Philology*, XXII (1927), 100.

⁴ Professor Scott, "Homer and Aelian," *Classical Journal*, XXIV (1929), 375-76, seems to have more; but until it is published and proves the contrary, that at my disposal can be regarded as a fair sample, although curiously enough no verse seems in it to be quoted twice by Aelian. The article calls for no detailed criticism.

22, *VH* vii. 5; σ 29, *NA* v. 45; τ 518-21, *NA* v. 38; υ 18, *NA* v. 54; ω 528, Fr. 127. Judging by paraphrases and allusions the following lines also can be ascribed to the text used by Aelian: Γ 370-75, 448, *NA* x. 1; Δ 144-45, *NA* xvi. 5; 310, *NA* x. 8; I 189, *VH* xiv. 23; 209, *VH* vii. 5; K 274-75, *NA* x. 37; 429, Fr. 282; 487-93, *NA* xvi. 25; Λ 416, *NA* vi. 1; 831-32, *NA* ii. 18; 846, *NA* xiii. 7; M 18-22, *NA* x. 37; 222, *NA* xvii. 37; Ξ 233, *NA* i. 43; O 605(?), *VH* iii. 9; Π 328-29, *NA* ix. 23; 384-92, Fr. 25; P 674-75, *NA* i. 42; Σ 237-38, *NA* i. 42; T 170-71, *NA* vi. 1; X 92-95, *NA* vi. 4; Ψ 118-22, *NA* xiv. 25; Ω 348, *VH* x. 18; 604, *VH* xii. 36 // ϵ 65-66, *NA* xv. 28; ζ 102-3, *NA* iii. 27; κ 84-85, *NA* xiv. 29; ξ 16, *NA* v. 45; \omicron 74, *NA* i. 52; σ 385-86, *NA* xv. 16. There are a number of other references: *NA* i. 34; ii. 3, 21, 30; iv. 40 (cf. vii 29), 54 (cf. xii. 3); vii 27; ix. 23, 50; xiii. 7, 17; xiv. 28; xv. 24; *VH* vii. 2, 5; x. 18; xii. 64; besides those to single words: ἀβληχρός, *NA* ix. 11; Fr. 179; ἀδευκής, *NA* v. 38; καλλίσφυρος, *VH* xii. 1; χρυσή (of Aphrodite), *NA* iv. 2, that are too general to be of use in the present connection.

The material is too slight to permit a positive conclusion, but it presents not the slightest difficulty to the natural supposition that Aelian was using the *a*-text. Not one of the additional lines, listed in *External Evidence*, pages 16-30, that have got into some medieval MSS and into Wolf's edition, "the text that we have," is attested by Aelian. The same is true for the lines of the *Odyssey* (listed in *op. cit.*, pp. 205-16) whose absence from the *a*-text can as yet be only suspected; for σῦες χαμαιαινάδες can come, not from κ 243, but from ξ 15, and presumably does so as an allusion to ξ 16 follows.

Aelian's method of citation is not to be taken too seriously. The normal thing is for him to give no reference; for his quotations are literary ornaments, and exact references are not allowed to deface them. Rarely indeed does he (cf. Index I, p. 487) even distinguish one poem from the other. However, in *NA* i. 42 (ἐν τῇ Πατροκλείᾳ), x. 37 (ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τῆς Τειχομαχίας), and xiv. 25 (ἐπὶ τῇ Πατρόκλου ταφῇ) he does locate a passage by a phrase descriptive of the context, but it is far indeed from being his regular practice. It may be a copying or an imitation of the earlier practice of which he has left (*VH* xiii. 14) us a description, or it may be an independent literary device employed occasionally.

Nor should we look to Aelian for criticism. The scholia show that *o* 74 was commented upon by the Alexandrians, and thus like all our other evidence guarantee its presence in the *a*-text. For Aelian the *a*-text was Homer, just as Wolf's edition is Homer for Professor Scott and some others. Nothing else mattered; and it is no more surprising to find Aelian quoting *o* 74, whatever the Alexandrians may have said about the line,¹ than it would be to find Professor Scott quoting, say, B 558.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

¹ To say that they "rejected" it seems an untenable interpretation of the scholia.

ITHAKAN ORIGINS

BY A. SHEWAN

IN *CR*, XLII (1928), 103, it is reported that Mr. Casson has suggested that "Achilles symbolises the Northern race, and Odysseus the Mediterranean race, which mingled to give birth to the Greeks we know." That will recall to some a long-forgotten essay of Gladstone's in the *Nineteenth Century*, 1889, pages 280 ff., entitled "The Phoenician Affinities of Ithaca," in which much the same view was propounded. Gladstone found signs of what he called "Phoenicianism" in the Odyssean account of the island, and referred it "to a source or cause grounded somewhat deeply in the fundamental ideas and aims of the Homeric poems." He concluded that "Achilles exhibits the pure Achæan ideal," and that "it is surely upon the Phoenician type that the character of Odysseus is moulded," and that in short the two protagonists of the epics are representative of two factors of the Greek race: the Achæan and the Phoenician. It is proposed here to submit some considerations which seem to confirm this view, with the substitution of "Minoan" for "Phoenician."

I need only refer briefly to the signs of Phoenicianism that were detected by Gladstone. They were the state of society in Ithaka, the race nomenclature employed during the transactions on the island that the poet has to include in his story, and also the "popular religion of the island." This last seems to be "not yet fully Hellenised. It seems to bear traces, possibly of an old Nature-worship . . . unquestionably of Phoenician importation." This was argued from worship of the sun-god, the nymphs, and Hermes. Pork diet was judged to be yet another indication; and so also the name of the haven Phorkys, to which the Phæacian crew, "who are Phoenician all over," brought Odysseus from Scheria, the connection with the Taphian Mentès, and the appearance of that very strange name for an Ithakan, Aigyptios.

Much of all this would hardly be accepted in these days, and especially it is vitiated to modern ears by Gladstone's peculiar view of the

connection in prehistoric days between Greece and Egypt. But some of it, grounded as it is in minute examination of the Homeric text, is not to be gainsaid. Particularly is that so on one point, to which I will give some space here. But before doing so it is well to mention that by "Phoenician" Gladstone did not, as most of his readers long supposed, mean Semite. What he believed to be the ethnological connection of the Phoenicians I cannot say, but I observe from the note on page 94 of Sir Arthur Evans' *Scripta Minoa*, Volume I, that he "always held that the Phoenicians were at bottom of non-Semitic race." So that there was nothing in his views that would have prevented him, had he been living now and known what we know of the Minoans, from accepting the "red men" of Crete as the Phoenikes of the *Odyssey*.

The one of Gladstone's reasons which I have especially referred to above is that we have in Ithaka "a spectacle very different from that presented by a homogeneous sovereignty." On an examination of the text he finds that Odysseus has at best but "a handful" of people to rely on, that he has even "cause to beware of a popular intervention in the fearful business he has to carry on," and that "the numbers in active partisanship are entirely with the party of the Suitors." The statement will not be concurred in by all in all its details, but the broad conclusion that there are indications of parties in the island will probably be accepted. It was supported by an argument from the phrase ἐξ ἀρχῆς. Menten in *a* 187 ff. observes to Telemachus that they are ξεῖνοι ἀλλήλων πατρώϊοι ἐξ ἀρχῆς, as the latter may learn by referring to Laertes, and it is suggested that this ἀρχή was the "first settlement of the family" in Ithaka. "And if they were immigrants they were probably Phoenician immigrants." An argument for "recency in the settlement" is found in the names the *Odyssey* gives to the three personages who are assumed to have been founders of Ithaka, viz., Ithakos, Neritos, and Polyktor (*p* 204 ff.), for "Peisandros a Suitor is called Polyktorides."

The phrase ἐξ ἀρχῆς occurs in three other places, all in the *Odyssey*. In one of these, *λ* 438, there is nothing relevant for present purposes. In the other two, *β* 254 and *ρ* 69, we have the same wording as in the passage in *a*, and applied to Mentor and Halitherses as friends of Odysseus, but all that can be said is that it is possible enough that

this Odyssean phrase has the significance which Gladstone claimed for it. It is usually rendered "of old," that is, the same as the commoner *πάλαι*, but there does seem to be something a little more pointed in the phrase.

I would add another interesting word from which the same possibility may be argued. It is *ἔδος* in the combination *Ἰθάκης ἔδος* (ν 344), where Athene tells Odysseus, *ἄλλ' ἄγε τοι δείξω Ἰθάκης ἔδος*, not the commoner *γαῖαν* or similar word. Now this use of *ἔδος* appears to be instructive. In Ω 544 and *Hym. Ap.* 37 Lesbos is called *Μάκαρος ἔδος*, and Makar is said to have founded Lesbos, coming from the East apparently. And in Δ 406 and λ 263 we have *Θήβης ἔδος*, and Thebes is also a settlement from the East, perhaps a Minoan colony. It may be suggested then that the same holds for Ithaka. The word surely has some special significance, and its occurrences noted above seem to point the way. *ἔδος* is also used of Olympus, *Ὀλύμπου, ἀθανάτων θεῶν ἔδος*. There it appears to mean simply "seat," and I will not press the observation that even Olympus had been recently "settled"—by the usurper Zeus.

And there is yet another, as it seems to me, very significant word, *Ἰθακήσιος*. Its first occurrence has always puzzled me. That is in B 183-84. Odysseus throws off his cloak, *τὴν δ' ἐκόμισσε κῆρυξ Εὐρυβάτης Ἰθακήσιος, ὅς οἱ ὀπήδει*. Why *Ἰθακήσιος*? Ithakan the herald was, as a matter of course, if he was herald of Odysseus. And why the description from country of origin? That is a most unusual way of describing a personage alive and active. I cannot suggest an explanation. I will discuss farther on another application of the word in the singular, but will only add here that the word is peculiar also in its formation. We expect *Ἰθακαῖος* on the model of *Θηβαῖος*, *Μυκηναῖος*, etc. The nearest formations seem to be *Περκώσιος* from *Περκώτη*, perhaps *Σιμοείσιος* (a person) from *Σιμόεις*, and *πρυμνήσιος*. The suffix is discussed by Curtius in his *Principles of Greek Etymology* (Eng. trans.), II, 269 ff.

The occurrences of the plural are eight in number. In five it occurs in a formula used in addressing an audience, *κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μεν, Ἰθακήσιοι*, by Halitherses twice, by Mentor, by the herald Medon, and by an old man Aigyptios. The first two are certainly on the side of Odysseus, and the herald, who has been of doubtful fidelity, has his life spared eventually on the intercession of Telemachus (χ 357 ff.).

Of Aigyptios we only know that he had a son who was a Wooer, and that another son had gone to Troy with Odysseus, from which latter fact, and his Eastern name perhaps, we may infer he was not ill disposed to the king. In all five instances it may well be that the speakers were addressing themselves to a party in the state to which they belonged.

In ο 520 Telemachus says of Eurymachus, τὸν νῦν ἴσα θεῶ Ἰθακήσιοι εἰσορῶσι. To Eurymachus I return farther on.

In ω 531 we have Athene bidding the Ἰθακήσιοι cease fighting. She was in the form of Mentor, and those she was describing by the appellation were Odysseus and his followers.

In the only other passage Laertes says (ω 353-55):

νῦν δ' αἰνῶς δεῖδοικα κατὰ φρένα μὴ τάχα πάντες
ἐνθάδ' ἐπελθῶσιν Ἰθακήσιοι, ἀγγελίας δὲ
πάντη ἐποτρύνωσι Κεφαλλήνων πολίεσσι.

Here it cannot be claimed that there is an implication that these Ἰθακήσιοι are the partisans of the royal house, but the line in which it occurs is of doubtful authority, for it is omitted from several manuscripts.

In the singular the word occurs once in the *Iliad*, as already stated, and twice in the *Odyssey*. In β 246 ff. the Wooer Leiokritos, son of Euenor, says in *agora* that if Odysseus were to come and try to expel the Wooers, he would meet his fate. And in χ 45 ff., after Antinoos has been shot and Odysseus has declared himself, Eurymachos addresses the king, beginning with εἰ μὲν δὴ Ὀδυσσεὺς Ἰθακήσιος εἰλήλουθας, and going on to beg for mercy. He admits that what Odysseus has said of the misdeeds of the Ἀχαιοί is correct; but the author of all the mischief, Antinous, has been slain—he who was bent not merely on marrying Penelope, but also on seizing the sovereign power. So now Odysseus may spare his folk (σὺ δὲ φείδεο λαῶν σῶν), and he shall be fully compensated for all his loss. Eurymachus is hypocrite and scoundrel (see esp. π 448). He and Antinous, both apparently native Ithakans, are the leaders of the Wooers, and both are aiming at succeeding Odysseus, not Antinous alone, as Eurymachus now says, but also himself, *teste* Telemachus (ο 522). In his mouth this rare form of appellation surely has some significance, as there may be also in the opening words of his speech (χ 45 ff.). It may well be, as Gladstone

thinks (pp. 282 f.), that 'Ιθακήσιος is contrasted with 'Αχαιοί, and that the former indicates adherents of an element in the population different from, though to some extent amalgamated with, the latter. There was certainly division in the community; there were factions,¹ and the use by Eurymachus of the two ethnical designations may mean that the division was along racial lines. It is true that in the *Odyssey* 'Αχαιοί is also used of the population of Ithaka generally, and naturally, as Ithaka has become part of Achaeis. The amalgamation of the two elements now suggested had no doubt gone some length.

What has been said about this word 'Ιθακήσιος, though it may not be very compelling, is certainly enough to make us suspect there is meaning in it, and this is strengthened by one fact which remains to be stated. I have already noted that its form is arresting; it can also be said that its use is all but unique in Homer. I believe I am correct in saying that, throughout the two poems, when, in a speech to an assemblage or in ordinary conversation, one of the dramatis personae refers to another, be he friend or enemy, it is, with hardly an exception, in one of four ways, by the simple name, by a periphrasis with βίη or the like, with a patronymic or other means of describing descent, or by the addition of some epithet usually of a decorative character, and not by an adjective derived from the name of his country. There is hardly an exception worth noting. 'Αργείη 'Ελένη and Ζεὺς 'Ολύμπιος are of course of a very special nature, and, Τυδεὺς Αἰτωλῶλιος, Θηβαῖος Τειρεσίης, and Εὐρυτος Οἰχालιεύς are heroes of a past generation, and one can easily understand the addition of the description. The only real exception I can find is Νῆσος Δουλιχειεύς, and that in a most casual reference (σ 127), to a personage outside the story. Everywhere else throughout the fifteen thousand lines of speech in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* the practice is uniform, and followed in hundreds of instances. The departures from it in respect of Odysseus, always, be it observed, in the course of proceedings relating to the supreme crisis of the hero's life, have surely, I repeat, some hidden significance, if we could but penetrate to it.

And what of Odysseus himself? He and other heroes of the Greek tradition are no longer sun-gods. We may take the conclusion expressed by Bury in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, II 478, that they

¹ CP, XIX, 309 f.

are, "like the geographical scenes in which they moved, real," as now the general opinion of the authorities. The name Odysseus has so far, for all that has been written about it, not been satisfactorily explained. Fick¹ thinks 'Ολυττεύς may be the Lelegian form of the name, while others refer it to the root ΔTK, which is a much-discussed element in the name of the hero's maternal grandfather, Autolykos, and Autolykos, be it remembered, is at home at Parnassos, a name the termination of which proclaims it pre-Hellenic. As regards the name Laertes, we are informed by Sayce in *CR*, XXXVI, 29, that Lavaltaei, an Anatolian name apparently, has long been identified with it.

Again, it may be suggested that the information we have as to the hero's personal appearance is in favor of what is now urged. When one remembers the small stature of the Minoans, as we see them on Cretan monuments, the fact that Odysseus is represented as being undersized is certainly relevant. I do not rely on the description by Polyphemus, ὀλίγος τε καὶ οὔτιδανός καὶ ἄκις (ι 515), for the ogre is obviously exaggerating, nor very much on the fact that Athene, when she is beautifying the hero for his appearance in the Phaeacian *agora*, has to make him μακρότερον καὶ πάσσονα. But in the *Teichoskopia* (Γ 161 ff.) Priam asks Helen, first of Agamemnon and then of Aias, ὅς τις ὁδ' ἐστὶν Ἀχαιοὺς ἀνὴρ ἥς τε μέγας τε, while about Odysseus the question is merely ὅς τις ὁδ' ἐστί, without the Ἀχαιοὺς, and not only without the ἥς τε μέγας τε, but with the very definite addition that he is μείων κεφαλῇ than the Achaean commander-in-chief.

As regards the hero's complexion and hair we have to depend on the accounts of his transformations by Athene. The advantage taken, in this very vexed matter, by dissectors of the *Odyssey*, of a supposed discrepancy or discrepancies is familiar. But it seems doubtful after all if there is any such. Let us examine the text.

In ζ 229 ff. Athene beautifies her favorite that he may be admired by Nausikaa, and in the course of the operation endows him with οὐλὰς κόμης ὑακινθίνῳ ἄνθει ὁμοίας, which the poet illustrates by the simile of a goldsmith who χρυσὸν περιχέεται ἀργύρῳ. What particular flower the hyacinth mentioned is, is doubtful; we cannot be certain of its color, but it has been suggested, as by van Leeuwen *a.l.*, that the simile means it was *aurei coloris*. When then the goddess subsequently

¹ *Hattiden*, p. 21.

(ξ 399 and 431) made a beggar man of Odysseus, and ξανθὰς ἐκ κεφαλῆς ὄλεσεν τρίχας, there is no necessary contradiction with the passage in ζ.

But there are two other passages to reckon with: π 175 ff. and ψ 156 ff. In the first the hero is to be recognized by Telemachus, in the other by Penelope; so surely here we shall have the real complexion. But they are supposed flatly to contradict each other! The lines in ψ, however, are universally rejected—I say this after reference to six standard editions—so I say no more about them. To get the fact we must rely on π, and there Odysseus μελαγχροῖς γένητο . . . κνάεαι δ' ἐγένοντο γενειάδες ἀμφὶ γένειον. Then why, it is asked, ξανθαὶ τρίχες in the Nausikaa episode? The answer is, Why not? We are told that in these days "gentlemen prefer blondes," then why should not Athene prefer that color for her then purpose? Surely the goddess would know better than modern critics what Nausikaa's taste was.

Monro on π 176 thinks the poet has forgotten himself, and quotes passages from *The Heart of Midlothian*, in which a lady's hair is variously described as black, brown, and fair. But that is unnecessary. There is no contradiction, and we may take it that the poet conceived his hero as of a swarthy complexion. And it is worth adding that it is far from certain that ξανθός is correctly rendered by *flavus* or "yellow." In the *Cambridge Ancient History*, II, 22 and 474, Giles and Bury prefer something "not lighter than auburn." Also, μέλας is not necessarily "jet black." It may mean merely "dark," so that the difference between the two words need not be so great as has been assumed.

And it may be added here that there is another important Ithakan who is certainly of the complexion claimed for Odysseus, I mean his herald Eurybates already referred to. He is mentioned in the *Odyssey* once, and is described (τ 446) as μελανόχροος οὐλοκάρηνος, with dark, curly hair. There can be no doubt about his racial connection.

But to return to Odysseus himself, another mark of Minoan origin may surely be found in his apparently strong interest in—and (τ 172 ff.) his intimate knowledge of—Crete. In most of his feigned tales he represents himself as a Cretan (see ξ 199 ff. to Eumaeus, τ 172 ff. to Penelope, and ν 256 ff. to Athene). Eumaeus in ξ 522-23 repeats the

story to the queen, that the beggar man hails from Crete, *ὅθι Μίνως γένος ἐστίν*, and it is in Crete that some wandering *Αἰτωλὸς ἀνὴρ* has told Eumaeus (ξ 378 ff.) that he had seen his lost master. All this may have some significance, and the mention of Eumaeus suggests one other small point. He and another servant of Odysseus of some standing, Eurykleia, were both purchased as slaves, Eumaeus certainly, and Eurykleia possibly enough, from Phoenikes. They may both be of Eastern origin; if we knew for certain where Eumaeus' home, the *νῆσος Συρίη*, was, we might be able to say, but that is not known. But there is this to be said, that, if the two retainers are of Eastern origin, some little special interest in a dynasty of the same provenance might be suspected from the fact that it is from them and them alone that we have references (δ 755 f. and ξ 181 f.) to the possibility of the royal house, described by one as the *γονὴ Ἀρκεσιάδαο* and by the other as the *φῶλον Ἀρκεσίου*, perishing utterly out of Ithaka.

And if the references to Crete have probably some significance, so also may those to Pylos and Elis. Elis is said to show signs of Cretan influence, and Pylos, a port of call between the south and east and the Far West, must be a place of importance with close connections with Crete and the south. In ω 430 ff., after the *Mnesterophonia*, it is to Pylos and Elis that it is thought Odysseus will turn, whether merely to escape from vengeance or to procure help, for which latter cf. β 326, where "someone" among the Wooers fears that Telemachus will obtain assistance *ἐκ Πύλου*. And in the flim-flam that Odysseus tells Athene in ν 256 ff. it is to Pylos or Elis that he, a Cretan, engages to be conveyed by some Phoenikes.

Then there is the cunning of Odysseus, for which it is not necessary to quote evidence other than the certificates from his guardian goddess (ν 290 ff.) and his commander at Troy (Δ 339). Hermes was the patron of his maternal grandfather and encouraged him in his evil ways (τ 395 ff.), and is patron of Odysseus too (ρ 319), though no evil influence is alleged there. And this cunning is just what is attributed to the Homeric Phoenikes. "Tricky tradesmen" Seymour calls them,¹ and kidnapers. They are *τρωκταί* (ο 416), *fraudulatores*, *deceptores* (Ebeling), and *πολυπαίπαλοι* (ο 419), with similar meaning. It is a slight bond between Odysseus and these men from the East.

¹ *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 61.

As regards the evidence of language, the only resource for the present seems to be the names of places in and around Ithaka, and these are neither abundant nor helpful. Much has been written—as by Movers, Olshausen, Lewy, Bérard, Oberhummer, and others—to prove a Phoenician, or rather a Semitic, origin for such names of places, but not with great general acceptance. A very attractive derivation is Olshausen's interpretation¹ of 'Ιθάκη itself as = *colonia*, comparing Utica, but Fick² would none of it. In his *Ortsnamen*, pages 86, 88, and 135, he compares 'Ιθακος, the name of a place in the Thracian Chersonese, and ascribes Κάρνος, an Acarnanian island, and 'Ιθάκη to the oldest population of the Ionian Islands. Ζάκυνθος is proved pre-Hellenic by its termination, and that Σάμη, the Homeric name of Cefalonia, is the same is shown by Strabo's σάμη ἐκάλουν τὰ ὕψη, the "they" being, according to Fick, the Leleges. We have it also on Fick's authority³ that all place names in -αθ- are *vorgriechisch*, so that Marathia in the south of Ithaka, mentioned by Paulatos, can be relied on. So can Phorkys, the name of a haven; it is Eastern (B 862, P 312). But generally the endeavor has been to explain names by Semitic connections, and, if Phoenician influence in the period round about the beginning of the eleventh century B.C. is to be ruled out, there is not much of use for present purposes. The further progress of philology must be awaited, for nothing is known of the Minoan language, and little of those of the pre-Hellenic stocks to which some would affiliate the early population of Crete.

Another point that requires passing notice is who Homer's Phoenikes were. Formerly they were regarded as the inhabitants of Phoenicia, and much was ascribed to them. But that view has been greatly discredited, and indeed it was always difficult on the Homeric text to accept it unreservedly. There seemed to be some distinction in the epic references, and even fifty years ago it could be said in Ebeling's *Lexicon*, s.v. Σιδωνίη, "Sidonios appellat Homerus ubi de urbe et artibus, Phoenices ubi de navigatione dicit." Since then much has been learned about the activities of the Minoans in the Mediterranean, and I believe it is correct to say that the general opinion now is that by Phoenikes Homer meant "the red men," and that inhabitants of Phoenicia only came into the western Mediterranean after the downfall of the Minoan power. I restrict myself to the following refer-

¹ *Rhein. Mus.*, VIII (1853), 329 n.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 4.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

ences: Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, page 80 and n.; Hall, *op. cit.*, page 532n.; Burrows, *The Discoveries in Crete*, pages 141 f.; Myres in *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (1910), page 163, referring to Hogarth's *Ionia and the East*; and in *The Dawn of History*, page 145 and Drerup, *Homer*, pages 56 ff. Victor Bérard, in his great work *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée*, now being reissued as *Les Navigations d'Ulysse*, has stated the old view in a heightened form and continues to defy the *phénicophobes*. He even speaks of the "thalassocracy" of the Phoenicians in Homeric days, on which see Murray's review of the *Phéniciens* in the *Quarterly Review*, 1905, pages 351 ff., and *RGE*, page 150n., referring to Myres in *CR*, X, 350 ff. The view that the traders and kidnapers whom Homer calls *Phoenikes* were really Minoans seems to be prevailing, and any arguments that have been used to prove Odysseus and Ithaka were Phoenician may be taken as indicating they were really in origin Minoan.

And there is the interesting question how precisely the Minoan dominion in Crete gradually merged into Mycenaean domination in and from the mainland. That has still to be determined by the archaeologists.¹ But it appears to be the case that, whether by conquest or by peaceful penetration, likely sites, that is, islands or peninsulas favorably situated for purposes of navigation and trade, were acquired on the mainland as early as 1500 B.C. *ἔδῃ* were in fact planted there, just as Surat and Calcutta and others were created on the coast of India. For Minoas see Bury in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, II, 475; other references are unnecessary. Pylos, Thebes, and other places appear to be in this category. In *CP*, XIV, 97 ff., I gave reasons for believing that Corcyra, the Scheria of the *Odyssey*, was another of the same. To a maritime people trading between Crete and the Far West by Italy and Sicily, a stopping-place between Pylos and Corcyra was required, and the advantages of Ithaka, which have often been enlarged on, could not be overlooked. In *Antiquity* (1927), pages 402 ff., I argued that it was a mistake to regard the island as having always been nothing better than an inhospitable rock out of which no good thing could come, and that there is good reason for believing the correctness of the Homeric picture of a prosperous community enjoying a high degree of civilization. For one thing I sug-

¹ See Mr. Wace in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, II, 427 and 454.

gested that it was unlikely that "an old bard, singing to a courtly audience . . . would say the thing that was not, not once but repeatedly, to men who were doubtless well acquainted with the facts." It need not surprise us that an island, well endowed by nature, that had become a port of call and possibly a *ἔδος*, and that was the capital of an island kingdom, should attain to the measure of prosperity that Homer assigns to it.

The evidence I have submitted above is, it must be admitted, neither copious nor strong, but it does seem to make a *prima facie* case. The subject, which, so far as I know, has not been comprehensively treated yet, seems worth pursuing, and the hope may be expressed that the experts, especially in linguistics and ethnology, will take a hand, and gather and present the evidence obtainable in their departments. The continued study of pre-Hellenic nomenclature is one likely source, and acceptable explanations of the names Odysseus and Ithaka would be specially helpful. So would more evidence, not, it is believed, difficult to find, of Eastern influence at Pylos and in Elis. I see that Bérard, in his *Navigations*, III 437, thinks it likely that the former succeeded to a Minoan settlement. The Thesprotian connection of Odysseus should also be explored. Fick has said¹ that "Odysseus und sein Geschlecht ursprünglich den Thesprotien angehörten," and see *CP*, XIII, 328 and XIX, 47 f. Chaonia adjoining Thesprotia on the north had an ancient name *Φοινίκη*. And continued "mining in the text," as Gladstone phrased it, is not to be neglected. Any old student of Homer will say, on his experience of recent years, that there is doubtless something still to be learned by patient investigation of the narrative and language of the *Odyssey*.

I have for some time past cherished the belief that a day will come when the great importance of Ithaka for the prehistory of Western Greece will be recognized, and I hope this paper discloses some slight but not unsubstantial ground for the belief.

ST. ANDREWS

¹ *Personennamen*, page 431.

THE SO-CALLED FRAGMENT OF HIPPOLYTUS, *περὶ ἄδου*

By HAROLD CHERNISS

IN HIS Preface to *Curious Discourses*, I, vi and vii, Thomas Hearne refers to the Baroccian collection of Greek manuscripts and remarks that a specimen of this collection, "a fragment of Josephus, or Caius, or rather Hippolytus's book *περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς αἰτίας*," he intends to print. This fragment is printed in Appendix IV of the work, and, since it presents a number of variants to the text as printed in the Gebhardt and Harnack *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* as well as a concluding section not mentioned by these editors, I have, at the invitation of Professor Max Radin, who came across this curiosity and generously put it in my hands, made a transcript of the variants which I here present. I have referred by line to the Gebhardt and Harnack text, V (Neue Folge), No. 353, 137.

The editor of this fragment seems to have been Dr. Gerard Langbaine, not Hearne himself, from whose text the antiquarian "transcribed it many years ago in my collections." (Hearne wrote this March 26, 1720.) The final section, especially, should be a distinct addition to the present knowledge of this early treatise on "Hell."

TITLE: Ἰώσηππος ἐκ τοῦ λόγου ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πλάτωνος περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς αἰτίας. Περὶ τόπου ἐν ᾧ συνέχονται ψυχὰι δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων¹

1. τόπος for λόγος; λόγος quoted from Hoeschellius.
περὶ τόπου for περὶ δὲ ἄδου.
2. ἀναγκαῖον εἰπεῖν omitted; quoted from Hoeschellius.
5. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χωρίῳ after τυγχάνειν.
6. τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον omitted.
δ before ὥς.
8. τρόπον for τόπων.
11. ἐσκεύασται for ἐσκενέασθαι.
12. παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ omitted. ὑπὸ θεοῦ quoted from Hoeschellius.
τιμία for μία; μία quoted from Hoeschellius.
13. προσηενέχθη for προσενεχθῆ; προσενεχθείη quoted from Hoeschellius.

¹ The text begins with δ ἄδης (l. 3). The figures on the left refer to line numbers.

16. αἴτιοι for αἵτιοι.
προσκριθῶσιν for προκριθῶσιν.
17. ἀνεκλιπεστάτου for ἀνεκλείπτου.
18. ᾤ for ὤς.
19. ἄδικοι for δίκαιοι.
23. κατόπον for κατὰ τόπον.
27. τῇ omitted; quoted from Hoeschellius.
ὀρωμένων omitted.
29. καύσον for καύσων.
30. πατέρον for πατέρων.
32. βιωτὴν for βίωσιν.
κλητίζομεν ὀνομαστὶ for ὀνόματι κλητίζομεν.
τούτῳ δὲ ὀνομα κλητίζομεν quoted from Hoeschellius.
33. εἰς inserted before ἀριστερά.
36. ἐπιτελοῦντες for ἐπιγελῶντες.
37. καὶ omitted before εἰς.
μέρη omitted.
38. οἱ for ἦς.
39. ὄντες omitted.
40. ταύτης for αὐτῆς beginning a new sentence.
43. οὐ for οὔτοι.
44. χορὸν for χῶρον.
45. μὴ for μήτε.
47. αἰ omitted before ψυχαί.
49. ποιησόμενος for ποιησάμενος.
50. Period after ἀνιστῶν.
αἰὲ omitted.
Comma after Ἑλλήνες.
51. Note on γεννητὴν: "Ita uterque Cod. et MS et impress. mendose tamen. Legendum ἀγεννητον. Plato enim in Phaedro (unde hoc desumptum) animam docet αὐτοκίνητον esse et proinde concludit: ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀγεννητον τε καὶ ἀθάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ ἂν εἴη. Atque ideo forsan pro χρόνῳ hic legendum φαίδρω."
53. ὥς before καὶ which is bracketed with the note: "sic Hoesch. sed omittit MS."
55. γὰρ after οὐ omitted.
56. ῥεθήσεται for ῥηθήσεται.
μὲν after ἡμεῖς omitted.
57. καὶ after γὰρ omitted.
58. Note on ἀπόλλυται: "Sic Hoesch. MS vero ἀπόλλυτε."
Note on γῆ: ὑποδεχομένη ἢ γῆ H.
59. πιαινόμενα for πιανομένον with note: "Hoesch: γενόμενα."
60. συμπλεκόμενα for συμπλεκόμενον.

61. καὶ omitted before κελεύσματος and δὲ inserted thereafter. Note:
"In MS Hoesch. κελεύσιμιν τι."
63. συμπαγῇ for γῇ συμμιγῇ.
67. ἀνιστάμενον for φθειρόμενον.
68. καὶ for ὥς with note: "Ὡς MS."
καὶ omitted before τοῦτο.
73. πάθοις for πάθους.
74. Note on ἐτελεύτων: "Sic Hoesch. At MS ἐτελεύτων."
καὶ ὅποια . . . ἐπενδύονται omitted.
78. κρίσιν πᾶσαν for πᾶσαν κρίσιν.
79. Note on κριτῆς: "MS κριτήρ."
80. θεὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα omitted.
83. ἐπιζητοῦνται for ἐπιζητοῦντας.
88. ἐπάγει before τὸ δίκαιον.
89. παρασχόντος for παρέχοντος.
91. ἀπονείμαντος for ἀπονέμοντος with note: "Sic Hoesch. At MS
ἀπονήμαντος."
93. διαφθείρον for διαφθείρων.
ἀπαύστῳ for ἀπαύστως with note: "Sic H. In MS ἀπαύστως."
δὲ δόνη for ὁδόνην.
99. ὕπνος for πόνος.
101. Note on δρόμῳ "Sic Hoesch. Sed MS δρόμον."
102. εἰγνωστων for εἰγνωστον.
104. Note on ἐπάγουσα: "Sic H. At MS ἀπάγουσα."
γῆν for γῇ.
- 106-7. οὐδὲ . . . ἀνάρριθμος omitted.
108. αὐλῇ for πύλῃ.
111. ἰχνοῦ for ἰχνους with note: "Ισ. ἰχνεος."
112. ἀναβάσεως omitted with note: "H. τῆς ἀναβάσεως ἡ ὁδός."
113. αὐτοματί for αὐτόματος with note: "H.: αὐτομάτη."
114. εἰ for ἦ with note: "Pro ei vero in MS est ἦ."
115. γένησις for γένεσις.
ζῶων omitted.
ἐκβρασσάμενη for ἐκβρασσομένη.
116. ἀνθρωπος for ἀνθρώποις.
γεννᾷ for γέννα.
117. δικαίος for δικαίοις.
118. Here occurs the note: "quae sequuntur primo ad fidem et
formam MSⁱ codicis (mendosi satis) expressimus. . . . Deinde
emendationem nostram (si forte) subjecimus." I give his MS
readings; his corrections only where they differ from the
Gebhardt-Harnack text.

- πνεμασι for πνεύμασι.
 τε after θεοῦ omitted.
 λόγου for λόγῳ.
 ὡς for δς.
119. χορὸν for χορὸς.
 ἀφθάρτως for ἀφθαρτος.
120. διαμένει (διαμένειν Ed.).
 ὕμῳ for ὕμῳ (ὕμνουτα Ed.).
 παραγόμενον for προαγόμενον (προσαγόμενον Ed.).
121. ἐν βίῳ omitted. (ἐν τῷ βίῳ supplied by Ed. who omits τοῦ after τῆς.)
 σνοις for σὺν οἷς.
122. ἀδιάληπτον for ἀδιάλειπτον.
 καὶ αὐτὴ ἐλευθερωθεῖσα omitted.
 (ἀπὸ τῆς φθορᾶς also omitted by Ed.)
123. διανγῇ for διανγῇ (δι' αὐγῆς Ed.).
 τε omitted.
 καθαρῷ πνεύματος for καθαρῷ πνεύματι (καθαροῦ πνεύματος Ed.).
124. δεσμος συνχοθήσεται for δεσμοῦ συσχεθήσεται (δέσμοις συσχεθήσεται Ed.).
125. ἀλλὰ ἐλευθερίαζωσα (ἀλλ' ἐν ἐλευθερίᾳ ζῶσα Ed.).
 τοὺς for τοῖς (τοῖς Ed.).
126. δουλίας for δουλείας.
127. ἀνέση for αἰνέσει.
 τοῦτους for τοῦτοις (τοιούτους connected with preceding Ed.).
 πίσθεντες for πεισθέντες.
128. καταλείψεται for καταλείψετε (καταλείψετε Ed.).
 ἐπιγενους for ἐπιγείου.
129. χρημάτων σπορου for χρηματεμπόρου (χρηματοποιου Ed.).
130. πλανησι νῶητε for πλανῆν συνώσητε (πλάνης οἶμον ὠθήτε Ed.).
131. καὶ θεοῦ καὶ λόγοις for καὶ θεολόγοις (καὶ δείου λόγου Ed.).
 εὐχειρίσαντες for ἐγχειρήσαντες (ἐγχειρίσαντες Ed.).
132. πιστεύσεται for πιστεύσητε.
 ἔσεσθαι for ἔσεσθε.
133. τεύξασθαι for τεύξεσθε (ἐντεύξεσθε Ed.).
134. ὀψεσθαι for ὀψεσθε.
 φανερώς (kept by Ed. and taken with the preceding) for φανερώσει.
135. γὰρ before θεός omitted. Here in MS occurs an erasure (καὶ γνῶσεσθε [omitting θεός] Ed.) a MS (ῶσα Ed.).
137. ἡτοίμασεν (retained by Ed.) for ἡτοίμασεν.

The following is not included in the Gebhardt-Harnack text. The MS readings are here given with editor's corrections in parentheses as before.

ἐφοῖς (ἐφ' οἷς Ed.) ἀνευρω (ἀν εὐρω Ed.) ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τοῖτοις κρινῶ παρεκαστα (παρ' ἑκαστα Ed.) βοατο (βοᾷ τὸ Ed.) τέλος πάντων. ὥστε καὶ (omitted by Ed.) τῷ (τῷ Ed.) τα (τε Ed.) εὖ πεποιηκότι τὸν βίον λήξαντος (λήξαντος Ed.) δὲ τοῦ τέλους (τέλους Ed.) ἐξέκηλαν τη (ἐξεκῆλαντι Ed.) πρὸς κακίαν ἀνοητοὶ (ἀνόνητοι Ed.) οἱ πρόσθε πόνοι ἐπὶ τῇ καταστροφῇ τοῦ δράματος ἐξάθλῳ γενομένῳ τότε (τῷ τε Ed.) χεῖρον καὶ ἐπισεσυρμένῳ βιώσαντι πρότερον ἔστιν ὕστερον μετανοήσαντι πολλοῦ χρόνου πολιτείαν πονηρὰν ἐκνικῆσαι τῷ μετὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν χρόνῳ. ἀκριβείας δὲ δεῖται πολλῆς ὑπερ (ὥσπερ Ed.) της (τοῖς Ed.) μακρὰν (μακρῶ Ed.) ὥσω (νόσῳ Ed.) πεποιηκόσι σώμασι διαίτης χρεῖα (χρεῖα Ed.) καὶ προσοχῆς πλείονος. ἔστιν δυνατὸν (ἔστι μὲν ἀδύνατον Ed.) γὰρ ἴσως ἀθρόως ἀποκόψαι παθῆς (πάθοις Ed.) τροφῆς (τροφὴν Ed.) . . . ἀλλὰ μετὰ (μὲν Ed.) θεοῦ δυνάμει καὶ ἀνθρώπου (ἀνθρώπων Ed.) . . . καισίας (ικεσίας Ed.) καὶ ἀδελφῶν βοηθείας καὶ εἰλικρινοῦς μετανοίας καὶ συνεχῆς (συνεχοῦς Ed.) μελέτης κατορθοῦται. καλὸν μὲν τὸ μὴ ἀμαρτάνειν, ἀγαθὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀμαρτάνοντα μετανοεῖν. ὥσπερ ἄριστον τὸ ὑγιαίνειν αἰεὶ, καλὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀνασφάλαι μετὰ νόσον.

Τῷ Θεῷ δόξα.

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

NOTES ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL INSCRIPTION FROM CYRENE¹

BY JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

FEW, if any, inscriptions discovered in recent years are of greater importance for the student of the Greek state than the one in which the name of Ptolemy is connected with a revision of the constitution of Cyrene.² Unfortunately scholars have failed to reach an agreement concerning the date of the document. In the present study an effort will be made to contribute something to the solution of this problem. Afterward a few remarks will be added concerning the interpretation of the institutions described.

The original editor, Ferri, identified the Ptolemy of the inscription as Euergetes and dated the document 248/7. In spite of disagreement in detail, this identification was accepted by Beloch and De Sanctis. Soon, however, several scholars came to the conclusion that the Ptolemy of the inscription was Soter, and that the document must belong to that period of his life when he had not yet assumed the

¹ The writer wishes to acknowledge the helpful criticism of Professors W. S. Ferguson, of Harvard, and S. B. Smith, of Bowdoin.

² The inscription was first edited by Ferri (with contributions from Wilamowitz and Klaffenbach) in *Alcune iscrizioni di Cirene, Abhandlungen* of Berlin Academy, 1925. It has been discussed further in the following works: De Sanctis, "La Magna Charta della Cirenaica," *Rivista di filologia*, IV (1926), 145-75, and "La data della Magna Charta di Cirene," *ibid.*, VI (1928), 240-49; Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, IV, 1, 616 f., and *ibid.*, 2, 611 ff.; Heichelheim, "Zum Verfassungdiagramma von Kyrene," *Klio*, XXI (1927), 175-82; Reinach, "La Charte ptolémaïque de Cyrène," *Revue archéologique*, XXVI (1927), 1-32; Groh, "Il diagramma cirenaico," *Historia*, I (1927), 112-16; Oliverio, "Iscrizioni di Cirene," *Rivista di filologia*, VI (1928), 183-239; Otto, "Beiträge zur Seleukidengeschichte," *Abhandlungen* of Bavarian Academy, *phil.-hist. Klasse*, XXXIV, *Abhandlung* 1, 76-79; Cary, "A Constitutional Inscription from Cyrene," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XLVIII (1928), 222-38; Groh, "Kyrenská ústava," *Listy filologické*, LIV (1927), 177-201 (not consulted by the writer). Briefer notes are given by Robinson, *Greek Coins of Cyrenaica*, p. xvi, n. 2; Wilamowitz, *Sitzungsberichte* of Berlin Academy, *phil.-hist. Klasse* (1927), p. 155; Wilcken, *ibid.*, p. 301; Rostovtzeff, *Cambridge Ancient History*, VII, 127; Tarn, *ibid.*, p. 713, n. 1.

Oliverio (*loc. cit.*) has re-edited the entire inscription with important emendations, and his text will be used. The document is designated a *diagramma* and will be referred to as D.

Articles cited in this note will be referred to when possible merely by the name of the author.

royal title. The first detailed studies defending the latter point of view were those of Heichelheim and Reinach. Their arguments seemed so conclusive that the identification with Soter appeared to have won general acceptance. Later, the identification of the Ptolemy of the inscription with Euergetes was defended by Oliverio in his re-edition of the document, and by De Sanctis in his second article on the subject. It would thus seem timely to attempt to evaluate the arguments of the various defenders of the rival dates and to solve the problem if possible. It is true that there is disagreement between the defenders of the earlier date concerning the precise point in the career of Ptolemy Soter at which the document is to be placed, but the fundamental problem is whether it belongs to Soter or Euergetes.

Oliverio argues for a date under Euergetes on epigraphical grounds.¹ The writer does not feel qualified to deal with this point, but feels that Oliverio is less convincing because he so obviously is anxious to defend the date which he has fixed. It is also doubtful whether we have sufficient material from Cyrene to be able to decide definitely on epigraphic grounds between, for instance, 325 and 250 B.C.

The scholars who have argued for a date under Soter have considered the numismatic argument conclusive. The document refers to *μναὶ ἀλεξάνδρεια*.² This was interpreted as referring to the Alexander coinage according to the Attic standard and as precluding the later period when the Phoenician standard had been adopted.³ De Sanctis, on the other hand, has suggested that the phrase in question might refer simply to money coined in Alexandria or according to the standard at that time employed in Alexandria,⁴ but is inclined to believe that the meaning is "Alexander minas" (*mine d'Alessandro*). He argues that this does not preclude the later date, for this mina might well remain in use even where the Attic drachma no longer was employed. He cites the well-known case of the Delphic accounts in which 70 Aeginetan drachmas make a mina.⁵ In a later article⁶ he

¹ Pp. 213 f.

² D 8, 9.

³ So Robinson, *loc. cit.*; Heichelheim, pp. 176 f.; Reinach, p. 17; Otto, p. 77; Cary, p. 222.

⁴ *Rivista di filologia*, VI, 246.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 246 f.

⁶ "Un pagamento degli Epidauri," *Rivista di filologia*, VI (1928), 523-27.

has discussed an Epidaurian inscription from the second half of the third century B.C. in which there likewise is a reference to a mina consisting of 70 drachmas. It is argued that the Attic mina was in general use in Greece, and that while in Attica it was subdivided into 100 drachmas, in places where the Aeginetan or a similar standard was employed it was subdivided into 70 drachmas. Likewise, Th. Reinach has gone so far as to designate the Euboean mina (this same mina) as Panhellenic.¹ So far the argument seems valid, but De Sanctis hardly seems justified in affirming, apparently on the basis of our inscription, that the Attic mina later also was called the Alexander mina (*mina di Alessandro*). This is possible, but the evidence hardly warrants the conclusion. Before this conclusion can be accepted, it will be necessary to prove that in the same locality one name was applied to the standard employed for the drachma and another to that employed for the mina. Such a procedure would be highly artificial. On the contrary, it can be shown that in the Delphic accounts the same name is applied to all denominations, talent and mina included, though the talents and minas of the different standards are added together as if they were equivalent.² This example leads to the conclusion that if the minas involved were called Alexander minas, the drachmas or staters in circulation would also be called Alexander drachmas or staters. Thus unless the phrase that has caused the dispute means merely "minas of the standard employed at Alexandria," the inscription cannot belong to the third century.

Another important argument for a fourth-century date has been found in the imperative forms employed.³ Wilcken specifically finds that they imply that our inscription is older than the Epidaurian inscription connected with the revival of the Hellenic League by Demetrius Poliorcetes. De Sanctis is probably justified in replying that a comparison between two documents of such different origin has little value for determining chronology.⁴ He further states that the supposedly early imperative forms of the inscription occur late in the

¹ *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, LI (1927), 172.

² E.g., Dittenberger, *Syll.*, 251. III. This inscription shows that the actual value of some of the talents and minas involved differed slightly.

³ Wilcken, *loc. cit.*; Otto, p. 77.

⁴ *Rivista di filologia*, VI, 249.

third century, and that they are so accessible that they need not be quoted. If they are so accessible, why not quote a few? Some such forms can probably be found, but unless there are more convincing arguments for a later date, it would still seem that the imperative forms employed would be most natural in the latter part of the fourth century. The most that can be said is that they do not make a date in the middle of the third century impossible.

Just as the numismatic argument has been claimed as an absolutely incontrovertible argument in favor of a date in the late fourth century, so the opposing side has found in the boundaries that are assigned to the state involved what it considers an incontrovertible argument in favor of a date in the middle of the third century. These boundaries imply that the state is not merely Cyrene but the entire Cyrenaica. This fact has been most clearly established by Oliverio's edition of the text. Coins indicate the existence of a *koinon*, probably a federal league, in Cyrenaica about 250 B.C., and it is held that since our inscription deals with a state that covers the entire Cyrenaica we must be face with this *koinon*.¹ The obvious answer is that the form of government is not determined by the boundaries or extent of a state. One might as well argue that Attica must have been a federal league because its territory was too large for a normal city-state. To continue with a comparison with Attica, our inscription points rather to some sort of *synoecism* than to a federal league. There is absolutely nothing in the description of the government and institutions that indicates the existence of a federal league rather than of a city-state. In discussing citizenship, there is only a question of Cyrenaeans and Libyans,² and the law of the state is referred to as Cyrenaeian.³ If then the state includes all Cyrenaica, it must be because all the Greeks of the district have been admitted to citizenship at Cyrene. This is seen by De Sanctis, who remarks that there really was no other federal citizenship than the citizenship of the capital, Cyrene,⁴ and again that probably the decisive step in the development of the *koinon* was the extension of the citizenship of Cyrene to all Greeks of Cyrenaica.⁵

¹ Oliverio himself attaches great importance to the question of the boundaries (cf. pp. 197 f., 238 f.), and De Sanctis, after having discussed them, begins the next paragraph: "Si tratta dunque nella nostra epigrafe d'un *κοινόν*" (*Rivista di filologia*, VI, 243).

² D 2-4.

³ D 56.

⁴ *Rivista di filologia* IV, 161.

⁵ *Ibid.*, VI, 244.

To be sure, it can be admitted that *koinon* need not mean a true federal league and might well be applied to such a state as the one described in our document. But it is hardly possible that a state that officially designated its law and citizens as Cyrenaean should inscribe **KOINON** upon its coins without any reference to Cyrene.¹ The constitution suggests the absorption of Cyrenaica by the city of Cyrene, while the coins, if they belong to an organization which included Cyrene, suggest the merging of the city in a larger whole. This makes it practically certain that the constitution referred to in the inscription is not the constitution with which the coins of the *koinon* are to be connected. So little is known about the history of Cyrenaica that there is no reason to say that it is impossible or even unlikely that at different times it experimented both with *synoecism* and with a federal organization. It cannot be denied that a place might be found for both these organizations in the kaleidoscopic changes in the middle of the third century, but since the *koinon* is known to have belonged to this period, it is more likely that the *synoecism* belongs to some other period.

The *synoecism* of Cyrenaica need cause no surprise when it is remembered that outside pressure may have made it impossible for the cities of the district to remain completely independent. Conflicts between the cities of Cyrenaica are known to have occurred, but the legend concerning boundary disputes with Carthage² implies the control or leadership of the district by Cyrene. Furthermore, *synoecism* was employed not infrequently by Hellenistic princes,³ and the *synoecism* of Cyrenaica might well be in accordance with the policy of Ptolemy.

The fact that the body of active citizens is called the Ten Thousand was probably the most decisive influence in causing Ferri and the other scholars that first studied the inscription to place it in the middle of the third century. This designation, it was thought, must be due to the Arcadian reformers known to have been active at Cyrene at that time.⁴ This line of reasoning is not conclusive. At the time

¹ Robinson, *The Greek Coins of Cyrenaica*, cxxxiv ff. and 68 ff.

² Sallust *Jugurtha* 79.

³ Cf. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilization*, pp. 60 f. The policy of Philip II shows a somewhat similar tendency to create larger units within the Hellenic League (cf. *Classical Philology*, XX [1925], 320 f.).

⁴ Ferri, *passim*; Beloch, IV, 2, 612; De Sanctis, *Rivista di filologia*, IV, 148 f.; VI, 244 f.; Groh, p. 116.

in question, it was over a century since the Arcadian League had been founded, and it is not known whether Arcadians at the time any longer considered the name Ten Thousand mysterious and sacred. Even if the use of the term is due to Arcadian influence, this may have made itself felt much earlier. Arcadian influence may even have reached Cyrene through Ptolemy Soter, for it is likely that Philip II had a hand in a reorganization of the Arcadian League,¹ and leading Macedonian statesmen must have been acquainted with his policy in relation to the chief Greek states. But it is more likely that the name is due to the well-known tendency to employ round numbers as names for assemblies or citizen bodies. It seems impossible to cite a case of the employment of Ten Thousand in this sense in a city-state. On the other hand, "a city of ten thousand," i.e., ten thousand citizens, seems to have been a common term, and it would not be unnatural that a city that was conscious of the great size of its citizen body should adopt this as a name for the assembly of active citizens.² Oliverio finds an argument for the third-century date in the fact that the inscription refers to Automala as the western boundary of Cyrenaica.³ This conclusion is unwarranted. Automala is known to have been near the Philaenon Arae, the traditional boundary between Cyrenaica and Carthaginian territory. From one source,⁴ it has been concluded that under one of the Ptolemies the boundary was advanced farther west to Euphrantas. Before the end of the third century the boundary was carried back to the Philaenon Arae. Oliverio consequently thinks that our inscription belongs to the period after the boundary had been moved east again from Euphrantas. It may equally well belong to the period before the boundary had been advanced to Euphrantas.⁵

There are also other features that make a fourth-century date more likely. Thus the natural explanation of the fact that Ptolemy

¹ Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (2d ed.), III, 2, 173 ff.

² Cary (p. 225) states: "A citizenship of 10,000 was a regular norm for Greek cities, and need not be considered as distinctly Arcadian." He cites Hiero's foundation at Aetna (Diod. xi. 49. 2). His reference to Harpocration, *s.v.* μυριάδης πόλις, remains a mystery to the writer. It is also possible to cite Isocrates *Panath.* 257 and Arist. *Pol.* 1267 b 31.

³ D 3; Oliverio, pp. 197 f., 215.

⁴ Strabo xvii. 836.

⁵ For this problem and further references to the literature on the subject cf. Oliverio, *loc. cit.*, and Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, IV, 2, 321.

is mentioned simply by name and is never called "king" is that the inscription belongs to the period of the life of Ptolemy Soter before he had assumed the royal title.¹ This is true even though defenders of the later date find plausible explanations for the absence of the title—for instance, in the desire to preserve at least the appearance of liberty.² More serious is the suggestion made by Heichelheim, the first scholar to publish an article favoring a date under Soter, that also at Ptolemais the king may have been permanent general of the city and in connection with the tenure of this magistracy may have refrained from employing the title of "king."³ But the evidence is scant, and the interpretation is doubtful. It can be said also that even if the title of "king" was omitted at times when Ptolemy as a sign of courtesy would pose simply as a general of the city, it would be surprising to find the title omitted in a long document regulating the relations of the king and the city.

The institutions described in the document also seem to fit the period of Soter. The most important analysis from this point of view is given by Heichelheim, who points to similarities between the institutions described and those of contemporary Athens and demonstrates the presence of Athenian influence in Alexandria at this time.⁴ The property qualification for active citizenship is the same as that of the oligarchic constitution imposed upon Athens by Antipater. The position of Ptolemy in the college of generals is probably suggested by the practice of leading Athenian statesmen who normally held the office of general. The *nomothetai* and *nomophylakes*, on the one hand, and the jury system, on the other, suggest Athenian influence. Naturally these last institutions do not supply an argument for the fourth rather than the third century, but the property qualification for citizenship decidedly smacks of the oligarchic institutions of the last part of the fourth century.

Finally, it seems that the civil discord referred to in the document is connected with Ptolemy Soter's first intervention in Cyrenaica in

¹ Reinach, p. 13; Heichelheim, p. 178; Cary, p. 222.

² De Sanctis, *Rivista di filologia*, VI, 245.

³ Heichelheim, p. 179, n. 6. The evidence is Dittenberger, *OGIS*, 743: Πτολεμαῖος στρατηγὸς πόλεως. For the relation of the king to the city, he refers to Plauman, *Ptolemais in Oberägypten*, pp. 26–29.

⁴ Pp. 179 f.

322/1. It is not to be denied that if on other grounds another date is adopted a way can be found to fit the events referred to into some of the many lacunae in the history of Cyrene. The various scholars who argue for a date under Euergetes have made very ingenious but highly conjectural reconstructions of the history of the period. But it can be maintained that something is known of the events around 322, and that these events correspond to the events referred to in the inscription. The writer is convinced that this is the case, though some scholars that argue for a date under Soter on numismatic and other grounds prefer a date in the period 308-306.¹ The most valuable study of the events that serve as a background for the document has been made by Reinach.² He points out that during the period of disorder in which Thibron and his mercenaries figured there was at Cyrene a democratic revolution as a result of which wealthy refugees fled to Ptolemy. This period of discord, the timocratic constitution that must have preceded the revolution, and the intervention of Ptolemy on the request of the wealthy refugees—all this corresponds to conditions presupposed in the inscription.³ In his settlement, Ptolemy did not side fully with either of the two parties to the struggle but established a moderate constitution that represented a compromise. Reinach, however, emphasizes the independence of the cities of Cyrenaica at this time. It is true that some of them acted independently during the period of disturbance,⁴ but this does not prove even that they possessed complete independence before the disturbances began, and still less that the settlement made by Ptolemy did not involve the establishment of a unified government for Cyrenaica.

But what about Ophellas? If the document belongs to 322/1, is it not strange that his name does not appear? Ptolemy was to be general for life, and it will be argued below that the list of generals given in the inscription contains the names of representatives that acted for him in this capacity, and yet the list does not contain the name of Ophellas. When the problem is given a little consideration, this is

¹ Heichelheim, pp. 177 f.; Otto, pp. 78 f.

² Pp. 17 ff.

³ Cary (*op. cit.*, p. 223), who worked independently of Reinach, also states: "There is only one occasion on which Soter can be shown to have befriended émigrés from Cyrene, viz. 322-321 B.C."

⁴ *Diod.* xviii. 19. 5; 20. 3.

not surprising. It is likely that Ptolemy was tactful enough to appoint a citizen of Cyrene to act as his representative, as Demetrius of Phalerum acted for Cassander at Athens. The natural position for Ophellas would be that of commander of the garrison or garrisons of Ptolemy. As such he might well wield more real power than the general that acted for Ptolemy.

Otto, who favors placing the inscription in 306, argues that a change in the constitution that involves an increase of the active citizens from 1,000 to 10,000 and uses a low property qualification involves too many concessions to democracy to be connected with Ptolemy's earlier intervention on behalf of the wealthy. It must, however, be remembered that the numbers 1,000 and 10,000 do not represent that precise number of citizens, and the change in the constitution may not have been as great as these numbers seem to indicate. Then, too, the constitution described may have been conservative compared with the democracy favored by the revolutionists of the time. Nor is it necessary that Ptolemy's settlement should be wholly in favor of the party that first called for his intervention. It is also possible that the increase in the number of active citizens is not due to a radical reduction of the property qualifications but to the admission of new citizens through the *synoecism*.

An attempt has so far been made to solve the problem of date and prove that our inscription is to be connected with Ptolemy Soter's first intervention in Cyrene in 322/1. A few remarks will now follow concerning the interpretation of the document.

The document designates itself as a *διάγραμμα*.¹ It seems that this means a document containing new laws whether they owe their origin to local or external authorities. In the present case, this means that *diagramma* might be applied either to an enactment of the local authorities of Cyrene or to a decree of Ptolemy.² It may be well to retain an open mind on the subject, and yet the contents of the document are such that it seems natural to conclude that we are dealing with a decree of Ptolemy.

In any case it is a document by means of which changes are in-

¹ D 38.

² For the meaning of *diagramma* and illustrations of various usages cf. Ferri, pp. 8 f.; Reinach, p. 24; Oliverio, pp. 201 f.; Cary, p. 223; and especially Plassart, *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, XXXVIII (1914), 109 ff.

troduced in the laws of Cyrene. The document presupposes the existence of older laws that are to remain in force except in so far as they are rendered obsolete by the provisions of the *diagramma*. This procedure illustrates how similar changes may have been introduced in other states. There too law may have been added upon law, the new laws canceling only as much of the old law as was in disagreement with themselves. Thus there is a suggestion of a dynamic process of legal and constitutional development.

Oliverio, though he is inclined to believe that the present *diagramma* is "un ordinanza fatta da un'autorità straordinaria, estranea al paese,"¹ later speaks as though the document were a treaty. He believes that it probably was introduced by the phrase 'Επὶ τοῖςδε συνέθεντο, etc.,² and believes further that the list of magistrates at the end is the list of magistrates that were in office during the period of strife down to the time of the agreement with Ptolemy, and that they are listed in the document as the magistrates that accepted the agreement in behalf of the Cyrenaeans.³ His argument, based on the discrepancy between the list of magistrates given and the magistracies described in the document, is not wholly convincing. The twelve *strategoi* of the list, he holds, cannot be explained as two groups of six, for the inscription does not permit the Ten Thousand under certain circumstances to elect a new college to serve alongside of the old, but to substitute a new college for the old. But there is no reason why στρατηγῶσι⁴ may not mean to take command of the particular campaign rather than to hold the office of *strategos*. Thus two groups of six *strategoi* can be reconciled with the institutions described in the document. In the second place, according to Oliverio, the fact that the list of magistrates includes *nomothetai* while this office is not included in the description of magistracies implies that this magistracy existed before the revision of the constitution and was abolished at the time.⁵ This conclusion is based on a misinterpretation of the nature of the document. Oliverio himself in other places recognizes that old laws remained in force alongside of the new regulations of the *diagramma*.⁶ Thus the omission of the *nomothetai* in the description of the magistracies can be explained better by saying that the office already existed and that there was no change in its nature or func-

¹ P. 203.³ Pp. 210-13 and 220.⁵ P. 213.² P. 220.⁴ D 30.⁶ Pp. 201, 203, 220.

tions. It is not safe to conclude that changes were made in all magistracies described, but yet the failure to mention even an important magistracy cannot be considered to mean that it is to be abolished. Finally, if the magistrates listed validated the *diagramma*, it is strange that no mention is made of this in the document, and that the list is merely headed by the one word 'Ἀρχαί.¹ Thus the more generally accepted explanation that the list of magistrates represents the first magistrates that served after the revision of the constitution seems correct.

This absence of any sign that the people of Cyrene had a share in validating the *diagramma* is an argument in favor of interpreting it as a decree of Ptolemy that is in the nature of a charter for Cyrenaica. This fits the fact that the account of the defeat of Thibron and the conquest of Cyrene by Ophellas implies unconditional surrender.²

In the remarks that follow, the constitution will be considered first as a pure republican constitution, and afterward the relation of Ptolemy to the government will be examined. This is possible since his control is secured without disturbing the republican institutions.

The *diagramma* first defines the qualifications for passive citizenship and then states the additional qualifications for active citizenship, that is, the qualifications that will entitle a citizen to vote and hold office. The word used for the entire citizen body including the passive citizens is *πολιταί*.³ The word employed to designate the active citizens, in opposition to the entire citizen body, is *πολίτευμα*.⁴ Though the latter term is employed in a great variety of ways, this meaning seems to be in accordance with the usage of Aristotle as well as with the usage of several inscriptions of the period.⁵ It may be noted that a man born of a Libyan mother and a Cyrenaean father was admitted to citizenship. In opposition to the entire citizen body, the active citizens are designated as the Ten Thousand.⁶ Except in the most

¹ D 72.

² Diod. xviii. 21. 9.

³ D 2 reads *πολιταί*. There can be no doubt about the correctness of this emendation.

⁴ D 5, 6, 28, 31, 43; cf. Ferri, p. 12; Reinach, p. 2; Cary, p. 225.

⁵ For a study of the various meanings of the word see Ruppel, "Politeuma," *Philologus*, LXXXII (1927), 268-312 and 433-54. For the usage of Aristotle see pp. 272 ff., and for a discussion of some pertinent inscriptions see pp. 294 ff. In Alexander's letter to the Chians (Dittenberger, *Syll.* [3d ed.], 283), there seems to be a clear case of the use of the word to designate the body of active citizens.

⁶ D 6. The qualifications are given in ll. 6-15.

general way, this name must not be taken as an indication of the size of the citizen body. The members of this body must possess property to the value of twenty minas. This sum is equivalent to two thousand Attic drachmas, the census required for active citizenship by Antipater when he in 322 revised the Athenian constitution.¹ Whether this property qualification seemed equally restrictive in the two cities is another question. It seems that the revised constitution of Cyrene replaced an older arrangement under which the body of active citizens was known as the Thousand.² In comparison with this disposition, the new constitution seems liberal, but this impression may be deceptive, for the increase in the number of active citizens actually may be due to the increase of the area of the state through *synoecism*. A conservative tendency is seen in the great emphasis that was placed upon age when selecting men to serve the state. All members of the Ten Thousand had to be thirty or more years of age,³ while, as will be indicated below, the age qualification for several positions was considerably higher.

A survey of the machinery of government as revealed in our inscription gives the impression that Cyrene had an excessive supply of magistrates and councils, and the difficulty of differentiating between the duties of the various organs of government leaves the student with the feeling that after all we know very little about Greek political institutions. In the first place, it is clear that the Ten Thousand constituted an *ekklesia* or primary assembly. Our document shows not only that members of the *gerousia*, the smaller of the two councils of the state, were elected by the Ten Thousand, but also that this body had the right to decide whether, in the case of a war outside of Libya, the leadership was to be assumed by the regular generals, or whether other generals should be elected for the purpose.⁴ It seems safe to conclude that also other elections and other decisions were left to the Ten Thousand, but this body probably did not have as great power as the *ekklesia* of Athens.⁵

¹ Diod. xviii. 18. 4.

² This is the natural interpretation of the statement in D 35 that the Ten Thousand are to play the part in the state formerly played by the Thousand. It is called in question by Beloch (IV, 2, 613).

³ D 12.

⁴ D 21 f., 28 ff.

⁵ It is natural to suppose that the elected magistrates, the *strategoi*, the *nomophylakes*, and probably also the *ephors* and others, were elected by the Ten Thousand. Oliverio (p. 220) mistakenly includes the members of the *boule*. These were selected by sortition.

The government included a *boule* consisting of five hundred members selected by lot. The members of this body were normally to be selected from among the active citizens of more than fifty years of age. In any case they were to hold office more than a year at a time, but it is not fully clear whether the normal term of uninterrupted service was to be two or four years. Half of the members were to be replaced at a time while the other half would hold over for an additional term of one or two years until they in turn were replaced. Old members were eligible for re-election after an interval of two years. If there should ever be too few men of proper age to keep the body filled up on this scheme, the *boule* was to be filled up with men over forty years of age.¹ This last proviso shows that it was assumed that at times there might be a shortage of men over fifty years of age. Thus it was the intention to utilize in the *boule* practically all available citizens of that age, so that when a citizen had reached fifty he could anticipate spending a large part of the remainder of his life as member of the *boule*.

Besides the *boule*, there was also a smaller council, the *gerousia*, consisting of one hundred and one members holding office for life.² When the constitution was revised, the members of this body were appointed by Ptolemy, but later vacancies were to be filled by the Ten Thousand by election from among men over fifty years of age. The fact that this was the body that Ptolemy chose to appoint indicates that it was an important link in the government, probably more powerful than the *boule*.

Both the *boule* and the *gerousia* were in existence before the present revision of the constitution, and both bodies were to continue to function as they had functioned before.³ The existence of the *gerousia* side by side with the *boule* can be compared to the retention of the Areopagus at Athens alongside of the *boule*, but it seems that at Cyrene the relative importance of the two bodies was reversed and that the *gerousia* was much more influential than the Areopagus was under the fully developed democracy at Athens. This conclusion can be drawn from Ptolemy's desire to control the body, and from the fact that the members not appointed by him were to be elected and not chosen by lot. It seems safe to conclude that also before the inter-

¹ D 16 ff. Cf. Ferri, p. 14; De Sanctis, *Rivista di filologia*, IV, 159; Cary, pp. 227 f.; Oliverio, p. 206.

² D 20 ff. The body is actually referred to as the *γέροντες*.

³ D 34 f.

vention of Ptolemy its members were elected. A further indication of the importance of the *gerousia* is the fact that its members were normally prohibited from holding other offices.¹ A little, but only a little, specific information about the work of the *gerousia* is afforded by the inscription. Among the tasks that fell to this body was the election of the committee of sixty that was charged with taking the census and revising the list of citizens.² It will also be seen that it had a share in the administration of justice.

It has been conjectured by Cary that the *boule* "was not divided into prytanies or committees in permanent session,"³ and that the *gerousia* "acted as a probuleutic board for the *βουλή*."⁴ This theory is plausible and might explain the manner in which the *gerousia* and *boule* are coupled in the administration of justice.⁵ Yet in the absence of further evidence, it cannot be considered more than a theory. The existence of a *gerousia* does not make a system of prytanies impossible, and such a system may have been provided for in older laws that remained in force.⁶

The first magistrate to be mentioned in the document is the priest of Apollo, who was to be elected from among the members of the *gerousia*.⁷ Next it is stated that Ptolemy is to be general for life. In addition, a board of five generals was to be elected from among the men of fifty years or more of age. The office could not be held more than once except in case of war when any member whatsoever of the body of active citizens was eligible. In the case of a war outside of Libya, the Ten Thousand were to decide whether the regular generals were to take charge, or whether others were to be elected for the purpose.⁸ In the list of officials given at the end of the inscription, twelve generals are listed.⁹ The natural explanation seems to be that there are two groups of six, and that one man in each group is the representative of Ptolemy. The listing of two groups is probably due to the existence of a foreign war for which a second group of generals had been elected. There was also a board of five *ephors* selected from among citizens over fifty years of age and a board of nine *nomophylakes*. In the case of neither of these boards was re-election permitted.¹⁰

¹ D 22 ff.² D 13.³ P. 227.⁴ P. 229.⁵ D 39.⁶ The Benghazi inscription referred to by Cary (p. 232) strengthens his theory.⁷ D 24 f.⁸ D 26 ff.⁹ D 73 ff.¹⁰ D 32 f.

The list of officials indicates that there was also a board of *nomothetai* of unknown number.¹ The latter apparently belong with the elected officials. As to the generals and *ephors*, the existence of these two elected boards points to the relative importance of elected magistrates in the state. Whatever were the specific rights and duties of the *ephors*, their existence alongside of the generals indicates that the leadership of the state both in military and civil affairs was intrusted to elected officials.

In the administration of justice there is more that recalls the familiar institutions of Athens. The inscription refers to a body of fifteen hundred jurors selected by lot from among the active citizens of the state. These jurors are mentioned in connection with trials involving capital punishment. In such trials, they are to act as judges in conjunction with the *gerousia* and the *boule*.² The procedure, at least in some cases, seems to have been that the generals acted as prosecutors, that the *gerousia* and *boule* first heard the case, and that, if these bodies favored condemnation, the case was submitted for final action to the fifteen hundred jurors or a jury chosen from among them.³ How the system functioned, it is impossible to say. If the two councils simply prepared the case for submission to the jury court and if the real trial took place before the latter body, then the judicial system would have something of a democratic flavor. It is possible, however, that the real trial took place before the two councils, and that the submission to a jury court was in most cases nothing but a formality.

Ignoring Ptolemy for the present, an attempt will now be made to evaluate the constitution of Cyrene as a republican constitution. In the first place, the census and age requirements for active citizenship stamp it as moderately oligarchic. Oligarchic is also the higher age requirement for offices and the importance of elected officials. It is true that the existence of a large body of jurors suggests the demo-

¹ D 85 ff.

² D 35 ff.

³ This seems implied in the statement that for three years (after the publication of the *diagramma*) those brought to justice by the generals and condemned on a capital charge by the *gerousia* and the *boule* were to have the right to choose between trial according to the ordinary process of law and an appeal to Ptolemy. It would seem that since the *gerousia* and *boule* already had acted, the court in question must be a jury court.

cratic jury courts of Athens, but it is impossible to say how great were the powers possessed by these jurors, for they were compelled to share the administration of justice with the *gerousia* and the *boule*. The presence of a primary assembly and of a *boule* of which the members were selected by lot also smacks of democracy, but any democratic tendencies were counteracted by other provisions. In the first place, the age requirements for membership in the *boule* were such that the members must normally have been men that were satisfied with the old order of things. In the second place, alongside of the *boule*, there was the *gerousia*, the members of which were elected for life and, as in the case of the *boule*, were men that had reached the age of discretion. This council apparently was one of the most powerful, if not the most powerful, organ of government in the state. In addition, both the civil and military administrations were in charge of elected officials. Finally, the guardianship of the laws and the work of law-making seem to have been reserved for small boards of which the members were elected. This arrangement again gives the impression of a conservative and oligarchic system.

On the other hand, though the constitution was oligarchic, it must not be considered excessively narrow. It has already been indicated that it seems to have replaced a constitution that was considerably narrower. The property and age qualifications for active citizenship were such that to confirmed aristocrats they may have seemed far too liberal. It is not likely that a constitution such as the one revealed by our inscription would seem excessively oligarchic except in a city accustomed to extreme democracy. Whether Cyrene had had enough of this type of democracy to create a large class dissatisfied with the present constitution is a question that need not be discussed here.¹

One other feature of the government may be noticed. It must have been a government that would make for continuity of policy. The very fact that it was controlled by mature men who possessed a

¹ Ferri (p. 13) speaks of the property requirements for active citizens as possible only under a strictly oligarchic régime. Wilamowitz (in Ferri's article, p. 34), De Sanctis (*Rivista di filologia*, IV, 157), Reinach (p. 6), and Cary (p. 225) consider the requirements low and the constitution liberal. Cary makes the mistake of saying that at Athens under the same *ritimia* "9,000 citizens out of 21,000 lost their franchise" instead of that 9,000 retained their franchise while 12,000 lost it. The only other interpretation that can be placed on Diod. xviii. 18. 5 is that the number disfranchised was 22,000. This interpretation is adopted by Tarn (*Cambridge Ancient History*, VI, 460).

fair amount of property would tend to produce a solidarity of interest that would serve this purpose. Furthermore, it has already been pointed out that most of the men above fifty must have spent a large part of their time as members of the *boule*, and that in this body only half the members were replaced at a time. The old members that remained normally would favor the same policy as they had advocated in the past, while many of the new members already would have had experience and thus would be acquainted with the traditional policy of the *boule*. Finally, the fact that the members of the *gerousia* were selected for life must have made that body also an influence making for continuity of policy.

The one problem that remains to be dealt with is that of Ptolemy's relation to the city. We here have an example of the arrangements made to keep control of a Greek city-state by a Hellenistic ruler who has not yet laid claim to the title of "king" or begun to make use of deification as a means of asserting his own supremacy. The way selected was to have specific rights reserved for himself personally. The most important right was that of being general for life.¹ Ptolemy himself is not mentioned in the list of officials among the generals, but it has already been stated that this list probably includes his representatives. There is no indication in the inscription that Ptolemy as general had more power than the five elected generals, but the office certainly must have made it possible for him to assert his will. The inscription also contains a reference to the mercenaries of Ptolemy.² This seems to imply the right to garrison the city or at least some point or points in its territory. It has also been conjectured that future decrees of Ptolemy were to be binding upon the city.³ Such a clause certainly is not impossible. Thus having the right of military occupation, the right to issue binding decrees, and the right to be represented permanently on what probably was the highest board of magistrates in the city, Ptolemy had ample control of the state. In addition, it was provided that the courts of Cyrene were not to be permitted to condemn anyone to exile without the consent of Ptolemy.⁴ And yet the ordinary administration of government would be in the hands of the regular republican government of the city, and as

¹ D 26.

² Reinach, p. 7, on the basis of D 51 f.

³ D 62 f.

⁴ D 41 f.

long as this remained friendly to Ptolemy, his interference might not be felt to be oppressive.

The arrangements just described would be the permanent arrangements for the relations of Ptolemy to the city. For the immediate future, he was given additional powers. The *gerousia* was to be appointed by him, and election was to be employed only in the future when vacancies occurred.¹ Nor was Ptolemy bound to observe the same rules with regard to the age of the members as normally applied. Thus he might pack the *gerousia* with his own partisans in such a manner that it would stay packed for a considerable number of years. He was further given the right to have people enrolled in the citizen body and to designate which ones of the exiles that had fled to Egypt should be enrolled in the body of active citizens.² It was also provided that for the next three years at least some of those tried on capital charges should have the right to appeal to Ptolemy.³

To conclude, it is clear that the *diagramma* of Ptolemy made ample provisions for his supremacy over the city. Even when the temporary measures ceased to be valid and he had to be satisfied with the arrangements intended to be permanent, these arrangements, though their exact nature in some cases is uncertain, are seen to have been sufficient to assure his interests. On the other hand, the city retained only so much independence as Ptolemy chose to leave. This situation, however, does nothing to diminish the importance of the insight into Greek political institutions, and particularly into the institutions of a moderate oligarchy, that is supplied by the document.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

¹ D 20 f.

² D 5 ff.

³ D 39 ff.

THE LOGIC AND LANGUAGE OF THE *HIPPIAS MAJOR*

By G. M. A. GRUBE

I HAVE discussed elsewhere¹ the general question of the authenticity of the *Hippias Major*, and attempted to show that those who class the dialogue as spurious rely on very insufficient evidence. Since then Miss D. Tarrant, who takes the view that it is the work of a pupil of Plato, has published a further article in reply to me,² and also an edition with commentary.³ I will not reopen the whole question here, for I think that most of my arguments still hold good, but will confine myself to a discussion of the logical content, and of a few points of language on which I think further light can be thrown. The strongest argument for authenticity is the fact that the philosophical content of this little work is thoroughly Platonic. The three definitions of "beauty" given in the second half represent the three aspects of the beautiful which reappear throughout the works of Plato,⁴ and the harmless pleasures of 303e point to the pure pleasures of the *Republic* and the *Philebus*. The same, I think, can be shown to be the case in Logic.⁵

CONTRIBUTION OF THE "HIPPIAS MAJOR" TO PLATO'S LOGIC

Apelt has pointed out⁶ that the *Hippias Major* might be described as a *vade mecum* for the student of logic, as in the first part Hippias commits three logical blunders, namely, confusion of the general with the particular, failure to differentiate between abstract and concrete,

¹ "The Authenticity of the *Hippias Major*," *Class. Quart.*, July-October, 1926.

² "On the *Hippias Major*," *Jour. Phil.*, Vol. XXXV (1920), and "The Authorship of the *Hippias Major*," *Class. Quart.*, April, 1927.

³ *The Hippias Major*. Cambridge University Press, 1928.

⁴ I have worked this out at length in my paper, "Plato's Theory of Beauty," *Monist*, April, 1927.

⁵ In spite of Lutoslawski's dogmatic assertion that the *Hippias Major* is one of those spurious works which "contain nothing which could be included in Plato's Logic" (*Growth and Development of Plato's Logic*, p. 194).

⁶ O. Apelt, *Platonische Aufsätze*, p. 220 n.

and *petitio principii*, or inclusion of the term to be defined in the definition.¹ It has also been observed that from the concrete and the particular in the first three definitions proposed by Hippias we pass on to the abstract and universal in the last three. But it is further worth noting that there is, even in the first part of the discussion, a definite advance and that certain elementary errors are cleared by the way: Hippias' first definition of "beauty," as a beautiful maiden, is plainly only a particular concrete example of beauty. When this is pointed out he proposes gold; which is, no doubt, still a particular concrete, but it would not at once appear to be so to an untrained mind, since gold is beautiful in combination with a large number of different things. This gives Socrates an opportunity to make plain that *προσγίγνεσθαι* when applied to ideas, is not to be understood in the literal physical sense, that the universal is not something which is added to the particular from outside. It is natural for Hippias, who has now at least understood that what we seek is not concrete, to propose his third answer, a happy life. For although still a particular, it is scarcely a concrete example of beauty in the same sense as the first two. The stupidity of Hippias is not overdone if we remember that at this time universal and abstract ideas were by no means generally understood. In fact, the sophist is made to go through the different stages which lead to the comprehension of the notions of abstraction and universality. This comprehension he does not achieve, as is amply proved by his again defining "beauty" as a particular in 304, and his confused criticism in 301b. But his mistakes help the author to dispel similar errors in the minds of his readers.

The most important passage from a logical point of view, however, is that in which Socrates tries to justify the definition of "beauty" as the pleasures of sight and hearing. It is here that we go beyond what is found in other short Platonic dialogues. We are told that this definition is merely an enumeration of the kinds of pleasures that we call beautiful;² a proper definition must do more—it must tell us what the quality is which these pleasures have in common, and which justifies us in applying a common predicate to them. This

¹ 291d-e.

² There is a similarly unsatisfactory definition of "beauty" in the *Gorgias* (474d), where we are told that a thing is beautiful because it is either pleasant (*δι' ἡδονῆν*) or advantageous (*δι' ὠφελίαν*).

common quality is the *κοινόν*, and several such *κοινά* are suggested in turn:

1. They are pleasures;—but so are all other pleasures, which should then also be called beautiful [298c].
2. To speak of all pleasures as beautiful would be ridiculous;—but this is no argument [299a].
3. They are pleasures of sight [*δι' ὀψέως*];—but if this is the essence of beauty, the pleasures of the ear cannot be beautiful [299e].
4. They are pleasures of the ear [*δι' ἀκοῆς*];—then pleasures of sight cannot be beautiful [300a].

Neither of the last two suggestions will do, for we are trying to find one common quality corresponding to the epithet *καλόν*, not two. Socrates has also made it clear that the pleasures of eye and ear are beautiful both separately and when they appear together, so that we must find a quality which appears to them both together and separately.

The argument is here interrupted by a question of Hippias: Surely any quality that is applicable to both together must also apply to each separately? Which comes to saying that any predicate that can be applied to a whole must be applicable to its parts. Socrates proves that this is not necessarily the case. "Alone," he says, "you and I are one and not two, while together we are two and not one [302a]." Though this seems obscure and artificial to us, it is really the simplest answer to Hippias' question. And it was an important step in the history of logic to realize clearly that a predicate which applies to two species or individuals when considered as a whole does not necessarily apply to them when considered individually, and vice versa. Having got Hippias to admit this, Socrates comes back to the main argument as quickly as possible,¹ and suggests another possible *κοινόν*:

5. They are pleasures of eye and ear [*δι' ὀψέως καὶ ἀκοῆς*];—but then neither kind of pleasure can be beautiful by itself, as neither a thing seen only, or heard only, affects both senses at once [302e].

This last suggestion might be right if only those pleasant things which are both seen and heard are beautiful, and Hippias tries to save the situation by saying that this is the case. Socrates refutes this by an

¹ The words *ἐξαρκεί*, ὥ *Ἰππία, ἀγαπήτὰ . . . ταῦτα* seem to imply that he was well aware that this argument could be further developed. But he had obtained enough for his immediate purpose, namely, that the common predicate he was trying to find must be proved to apply to these two kinds of pleasure both conjointly and separately.

argument which is fallacious, but which Plato probably thought valid, namely, that although it has been proved that certain predicates may apply to two things together and not apply to them separately, beautiful is not such, and that if two things together are beautiful, they must also be individually beautiful.¹ Plato's mistake is not, therefore, that he thought it worth while to establish a valuable principle of logic, that a whole may have predicates which are not applicable to its various parts, but that he did not go far enough, and failed to see that "beautiful" is such a predicate. But although Socrates' argument is fallacious, he is right in rejecting the last suggestion, and the definition of "beauty" as the pleasant to eye and ear is then definitely rejected after the sixth and last attempt at finding a common quality proves unsatisfactory:

6. They are the most harmless pleasures [*δυνέσταιαι*];²—but harmless is identified with advantageous, and the same objection holds good as was brought up against the previous definition of beauty as the advantageous [*ὀφελιμον*] namely that the cause of good cannot be identical with it.

Now in insisting in this manner that a definition must explain the common quality expressed by the word to be defined, Socrates foreshadows in the *Hippias Major* Plato's later theory of *διαίρεσις*, whereby, to find a proper definition of any word, we must proceed by division not merely according to names, but according to meaning (not *κατ' ὀνόματα*, but *κατ' εἶδη*). Our division of pleasures into two classes, those of sight and hearing, on the one hand, and all other pleasures, on the other, is unsound unless we can find a common quality which they share and which the other pleasures do not possess. It is not enough to assert that there is such a quality, the beautiful, we must define what it is. And if we cannot do this, our division is as arbitrary as that of humanity into men and women, which is condemned in the *Republic*,³ as not corresponding to any fundamental difference (except for the purpose of procreation), or that which the Greeks are apt to make when they divide humanity into Greeks and non-Greeks, rejected in the *Politicus*. This method of division is, of

¹ This is, of course, not the case. See Valentine, *The Psychology of Beauty*, p. 95. That Plato made this mistake is not surprising. Plotinus also thought that a beautiful whole must be composed of beautiful parts. See Bosanquet, *History of Aesthetics*, p. 117.

² We also find the expression *ἡδονὰς ἀσυνεῖς* in *Laws* ii. 670d.

³ *Rep.* v. 454 and 455d.

course developed in the *Sophist* and the *Politicus*,¹ but throughout Plato is arguing against the same divisions that do not correspond to a common quality, such as that of pleasure in our dialogue. It would seem then that the *Hippias Major* does contribute something to the development of logic, and that what it contributes is thoroughly Platonic.

LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE

Many of the words and expressions condemned by Miss Tarrant have been discussed in the articles referred to above. Here I will only deal with such points of language upon which I think further light can be thrown:

281b: θαμίζω εἰς τούδε τοὺς τόπους

is used with the dative in *Rep.* i. 328c (quoted by the editor), and absolutely in *Laws* viii. 843b. A glance at the lexicons will show that the usage of this somewhat rare and epic word was not fixed.

281d: ἐξικνεῖσθαι

is said to be "chiefly poetic," but Liddle and Scott give fifteen prose examples. The usual prose meaning is "to attain" (*Thuc.* i. 70, etc.); while in *Prot.* 311d it must mean "to suffice," which is probably the meaning here.

Δαίδαλον

Wilamowitz, as our editor notes, says that this point of view (i.e., that the work of Daedalus would seem ridiculous compared with modern sculpture) seems un-Platonic (*Platon*, II, 38, n. 3). It should be obvious that Socrates is being ironical and that he considers the pretensions of modern sculptors as absurd as those of Hippias (φασιν οἱ ἀνδριαντιστοί).

282d: τῶν καλῶν

a Hippian periphrasis for οὐδὲν καλόν: "You're all wrong about this."

284e: ὀνομάζειν οὕτω

We are told that "this absolute use of ὀνομάζειν [to use words thus], with an adverb only, is not paralleled in Plato." But the identical use appears in *Theaet.* 201d: οὕτωςι καὶ ὀνομάζων. See also *Theaet.* 160b.

285c: τὰ οὐράνια πάθη

This use of the adjective with πάθη is paralleled by *Ion* 285b, τῶν οὐρανίων παθήματων.

¹ See the definition of the sophist, where Plato insists that it is not the word, but the thing itself that is to be defined (*Sophist* 218). Another attempt is made in 264b, where we get more information about the method *ὡς ἂν αὐτοῦ τὰ κοινὰ πάντα διέλοντες*. In the *Politicus*, though the details are carelessly worked out and a step is left out in repetition (cf. 264e and *Soph.* 223a; also *Soph.* 219d and 255a), the same emphasis is laid on the necessity of a logical division *κατ' εἶδη*, wherein each μέρος corresponds to an εἶδος. See also *Politicus* 263b, 265a, 286d, 287c; *Philebus* 14e, 16 c-e).

286d: ἀναμαχοῦμενος

The word is transitive in Arist. and Theophr. (references in Liddle and Scott), and may well be so in *Phaedo* 89c (νικήσω ἀναμαχοῦμενος . . . τὸν λόγον) as well as in *Herod.* v. 21 and viii. 109.

287a: μὴ τι κωλύω

For the "unique" use of this verb with a personal subject see *Lysis* 207e: καὶ μάλα γε πολλὰ κωλύουσι; *Laws* viii. 824. Cf. *Gorg.* 458d: τό γ' ἐμὸν οὐδὲν κωλύει.

ἐμπειρός εἰμι τῶν ἀντιλήψεων

should be translated: "I am well versed in the objections" (i.e., the objections which the imaginary speaker would make). There is no reference to Socrates' dialectical skill.

290a: τωθάζεται

ἀλλὰ πάντῃ shows that the verb is felt to be a strong one, as τῷ ὄντι does in *Rep.* v. 474b.

290b: ὅτι

"to explain the fact that"; see *Euthyphro* 2a and Burnet's note *ad loc.*

290d: Ἡρακλεῖς

The editor says, "a frequent exclamation in comedy," and quotes three examples from Aristophanes. But see *Euthyphro* 4a; *Sympos.* 213b; *Rep.* i. 337a; *Meno* 91c; *Charm.* 154d.

290e: γενναῖον

is only used of food here and in *Rep.* ii. 372b, as far as I know; but the word is so common as to be applicable to almost anything (see *Ast's Lexic. Platon.*).

292b: καὶ ἐμοί

"Hippias," says the editor, "shows surprising meekness in thus agreeing with Socrates' judgment." But clearly, what Hippias means is "Well, if you're fool enough to think so, then you *do* deserve it."

296d: ἀπλῶς

To the references given in *Class. Quart.*, XX, 140, add *Laches* 178d, *Rep.* i. 331c and 380d. Also for ψύχη add *Symp.* 215e, 218a; *Apol.* 29e, where see Burnet's note.

297e: πάσας τὰς ἡδονάς

is *not* cognate accusative of χαίρειν, which would indeed be an unusual construction, but object of φαίμεν understood. Translate: "If we were to say that that which gives us pleasure, that is not all pleasures but the pleasant through hearing and sight, if we were to say that this is the beautiful. . . ."

300c: λέξεις λόγων

refers to the kind, method, or style of the discussion, as opposed to the subject matter, Cf. *Apol.* 17d: ἀτεχνῶς οὖν ξένως ἔχω τῆς ἐνθάδε λέξεως.

Λέξις is also opposed to the matter under discussion in *Rep.* iii. 400d: "I would indeed be ignorant of the nature of these things and of the kind of discussion we are now holding."

ἡδέως γε

For derisive meaning see *Parmen.* 131b.

I would also point out that if we have here a parody of the style of Hippias, we may naturally expect a certain number of expressions which are not typical of Plato to be put in the mouth of the sophist. This would account for such expressions as οὐ νόμος (284c), ἐνδικος (292b), εὐφήμα (293a), to which the δύσφημα of Socrates is a natural reply, διανεκῇ (301e) (where Socrates merely repeats Hippias' word), τὸ ὅλον τοῦτο (288e), κνήσματα, περιτμήματα (304a), and one or two rather stilted constructions such as ἀπαλλάξεις σπαντὸν (291), πεπονθίας τι τῶν ὄντων (300b), λόγον καταστησάμενον (304a). Hippias also displays a fondness for high-sounding adverbs (in which he is echoed by Socrates) such as εὐδόξως (287e), μεγαλείως (291e). Also the imaginary interlocutor is spoken of with awe, and a few words with an epic flavor are very effective in this connection: σχέρλιος in its Homeric sense of "hard-hearted" (289e), μέρμερος (290e) γεγωνεῖν (292d) while the words μῆνιν (282a) and περιστέλλειν (291e) are used by Hippias in their exact sense: the former of the wrath of the gods, the latter of wrapping up a corpse. Though this admittedly leaves us with a few unusual words, there are some such in every Platonic work, and there seems no reason to consider this in any way sufficient to declare our dialogue spurious.¹ If we add to this the fact that the philosophic content is thoroughly Platonic,² the case for authenticity seems overwhelming.

TRINITY COLLEGE
TORONTO

¹ This is also the opinion of Professor A. E. Taylor, whose name may therefore be added to the list of those who uphold the genuineness of the *Hippias Major*. See *Plato, The Man and His Work*, pp. 13-14: "an unusual word or two. . . ."

² Even if one were to believe with Miss Tarrant that our dialogue contains a criticism of the ontological terminology of the *Phaedo*, and that the *Parmenides* contains traces of this criticism, it is surely more likely that this criticism should come from Plato himself than from an imaginary pupil, brought into existence for the special purpose of solving the difficulties of modern scholars.

SOME NOTES ON THE *AGRICOLA* OF TACITUS

By MIGNONETTE SPILMAN

IT MAY be asserted with little doubt that for more than four centuries the text of Tacitus' *Agricola* rested on two manuscripts alone, Vatican lat. 3429, now known as A, and Vatican lat. 4498, or B.¹ These are apparently of common ancestry. In 1900, Leuze published a collation of Codex Toletanus (T), a manuscript which had come to light about 1896 in the Chapter Library at Toledo in Spain. The Iesi manuscript (E), oldest of the manuscripts of the *Agricola*, was the last to be discovered. As recently as 1907 Annibaldi published the tenth-century Codex Aesinas, which he had found in 1902 in the library of Count Balleani at Iesi, a small town near Ancona on the east coast of Italy. The other manuscripts are of the fifteenth century.

Scholars have generally recognized the Iesi manuscript as the archetype of the group. Leuze had come to the conclusion that T, A, and B were derived from a common source; and Annibaldi considered T a direct copy of E, an opinion which the late Professor Haverfield reflected in his résumé of the history of the manuscripts of the *Agricola*.²

These items outline the topsy-turvy progress of the development of the text of the *Agricola*. Though it was confidently expected that the Iesi manuscript would clear up the difficulties of text in considerable measure, critics are still uncomfortable before a number of problems that are generally looked upon as textual. Perhaps the remedy for some of these is to be sought for in other departments of criticism, for the situation in the *Agricola* is complicated, as it is in few other

¹ It has been thought by some scholars that Puteolanus, to whom we owe the first printed edition of the *Agricola*, had access to the readings of another manuscript. The references of Ursinus to a *vetus codex* in the *Notae* on the *Agricola* (1595) have also given credence to the view that another manuscript existed at that time. Such an assumption has gained little favor.

For the details of the manuscript tradition, given in brief summary here, see the account of F. Haverfield in Anderson's revision of Furneaux's edition of the *Agricola* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), *Introd.*, pp. ix-xviii.

² *Op. cit.*, p. xvii. For a different view regarding T, see G. Jaekel, *De Taciti Germaniae atque Agricolae Codicibus Aesinate et Toletano* (Diss., Berlin, 1926), and A. Gudeman's review of this work in *Phil. Woch.*, XLVI (1926), 1413-20.

cases, by the obtrusion of various stylistic factors. What appears to be a doubtful reading may conceivably be an instance of the struggle of a pen that was still new and sometimes awkwardly handled, to express some fine subtlety of thought, or it may be a bit of venturesome diction for which no parallels can be cited, nor would Tacitus be willing that there should be. At any rate, even after the discovery of two new manuscripts, Professor Haverfield declared, "It remains true, as Furneaux wrote twenty years ago, that the difficulties of scholarship are greater in the *Agricola* than in any other part of the works of Tacitus."¹

Professor Anderson's decision regarding certain vexed problems in the *Agricola* invites comment; and the point of departure for the following notes has been the text of his 1922 revision of Furneaux.

I

Agricola xx. 2 (6-9):² et nihil interim apud hostis quietum pati, quo minus subitis excursibus popularetur; atque ubi satis terruerat, parcendo rursus *invitamenta pacis* ostentare.

Though the manuscripts are practically unanimous in reading *irritamenta* (*irr.* corrected from *inr.* in E), most editors of the *Agricola* have preferred *invitamenta*, the conjecture of Acidalius. Among these are Annibaldi, Goelzer, and Anderson, whose work is recent. *Invitamenta* was vigorously supported by Wex in his *Prolegomena*.³ Gudeman and Stuart read *incitamenta*, the correction of A.

It is difficult to see what compensation is to be gained by changing the text to *incitamenta*.⁴ Gudeman supports his adoption of this reading for his edition of the text by the argument that Tacitus phrased *incitamenta pacis* here on the analogy of *incitamenta belli*, which he later used in the *Annals*.⁵ It is, as Stuart points out, an easier change

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. xviii.

² The first reference cites chapter and section as in Anderson; the second, in parentheses, gives the line reference as it occurs in the Teubner edition of Halm. References to Tacitus' other works and to other Latin authors conform to the arrangement of the Teubner texts.

³ Fr. Carolus Wex, *C. Cornelii Taciti de Vita et Moribus Cn. Iulii Agricola Libris* (Brunsvigae, 1852), *proleg.*, pp. 72 f.

⁴ Anderson considers *incitamenta* clearly a conjecture of the copyist.

⁵ Tacitus *Annales* xii. 34. 2. See A. Gudeman, *Tacitus, Agricola and Germania* (Boston, 1900), *ad loc.*

from *inritamenta* than is *invitamenta*, but the difference in the meaning of these two words would demand a defense of *incitamenta* against *invitamenta* in addition to paleographical considerations. *Incitamenta* and *irritamenta* are used with similar nouns, e.g., *incitamenta irarum* (Tacitus *Annales* i. 55.15); *inritamentum istud irarum* (Pliny *Panegyricus* viii. 15); *in aliis imagines maiorum incitamentum cupidinis habebat* (Tacitus *Annales* vi. 1.10); *inritamenta cupiditatis* (Quintilian *Declamationes* iii. 6.5).

The crux of the problem is in the comparative merits of the reading of the manuscripts, *irritamenta*, and the conjecture of Acidalius, *invitamenta*, a word which is found in no other place in Tacitus. *Irritamenta* has troubled editors because it does not seem appropriate to the context and because it is a word regularly used of stimuli prompting to action (*ad quamvis virium exercitationem*, as Wex put it), rather than the acceptance of some condition or state.¹ It has also been claimed that the resulting activity stimulated by *irritamenta* is properly harmful or undesirable rather than beneficial.

The last point, which Wex did not consider a valid objection, is easily disposed of. Walch cited a passage from Quintilian which satisfactorily refutes it.

Quintilian *Inst. Orat.* i. 1, 26: non excludo autem, id quod est inventum irritandae ad discendum infantiae gratia, eburneas etiam litterarum formas in lusum offerre.

To this may be added the following similar case:

Cicero *Republica* i. 30: istae quidem artes . . . id valent, ut paulum acuant et tamquam iritent ingenia puerorum, quo facilius possint maiora discere.

Certainly, whatever may be the theory of modern educationalists, learning one's letters was not in Quintilian's time deemed an injurious activity.

Among other relevant passages the following may be noted:

Seneca *Epistulae* i. 9. 17: ad amicitiam fert illum . . . naturalis inritatio.

Ovid relates that Nessus gave to Deianira the mantle that was stained with blood from the wound dealt him by Hercules, telling her that it would be a love-philter which would restore the love of her husband. The fact that it actually worked as a poison and that Nessus

¹ Cf. Wex, Furneaux, and Anderson, *ad loc.*

intended that it should contrast vividly with his representation of it as a force which would bring back her happiness, *velut irritamen amoris*.

Ovid *Metamorphoses* ix. 131-33:

excepit hunc Nessus: neque enim moriemur inulti,
secum ait: et callido velamina tincta cruore
dat munus raptae, velut irritamen amoris.

While it may be granted that *inrito* is more frequently and easily employed to express provocation to undesirable or harmful procedures, the exceptions are entirely sufficient to validate the phrase *irritamenta pacis* in the *Agricola*.¹ Lundström, however, defends this reading on the basis that Tacitus meant to picture peace in this passage as the equivalent of subjection and moral decline.² Such an interpretation anticipates the scornful comment that Tacitus makes at the close of the next chapter: *idque apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur, cum pars servitutis esset*. This does not accord with the tenor of the context in which the phrase occurs, as will be shown later.

The second objection to *irritamenta* is, to repeat, that it is used of stimuli prompting to action rather than to accept some condition or state. Therefore *invitamenta pacis*, "allurements to accept peace," has been the reading preferred by many editors.³ Just how Tacitus would use *invitamenta* cannot easily be determined, since he does not employ it elsewhere, but he does use *irritamenta* with nouns that describe a state of mind or a condition. Such phrases, however, connote an activity of the person, not the mere acceptance of something. Thus *irritamenta libidinum* (*Historiae* i. 88. 14) means "incentives to practice licentiousness." A similar case appears in *invitamenta luxui* (*Annales* xiv. 15. 8).⁴ It seems clear that if Tacitus wrote *irritamenta pacis* he meant "stimuli to practice peace."

Those who favor *invitamenta pacis* also find support in its appropriateness to a personified peace pictured in the preceding passage.⁵

¹ Cf. Sallust *Jugurtha* lxxxix. 7: *neque salem neque alia invitamenta gulae quaerébant*. (See also Tacitus *Historiae* ii. 62. 5.)

² V. Lundström, "Agricola-texten och de gamla bladen i Iesi-handskriften," *Eranos*, VII (1907), 9.

³ Wex supports *invitamenta pacis* by Ovid's *invitat somnos* (*Metamorphoses* xi. 604). This may suggest an emphasis upon peace as absolute inactivity, an inert condition.

⁴ Cf. Tacitus *Annales* iii. 54. 14, where the concept of *luxus* is clearly implied by the context.

⁵ *Agricola* xx. 1 (1-2): *egregiam famam paci circumdedit*.

This raises the query: Shall the present passage be interpreted in the light of a foregoing reference to peace, or of a subsequent comment; or can the phrase be elucidated by its immediate context? There is reason to feel that Tacitus has painted here three different settings for the idea of peace.

Agricola attacked the problem of establishing peace with the Britons in three ways. His first step was toward administrative reforms and the correction of abuses suffered by the provincials under previous governors. Agricola thus initiated his program for peace by removing the causes of war.¹ Measures to this end are described in chapter xix. Peace had acquired a bad reputation under former régimes and was consequently dreaded by the provincials no less than war.² Agricola, therefore, in his first winter had by civil measures repressed the causes of dissatisfaction and placed around peace the supporting wall of a good name. Tacitus puts it as follows: *haec primo statim anno comprimendo egregiam famam paci circumdedit*.³

In the following summer the new governor of Britain employed a very different weapon, the force of his army. After the resumptive sentence quoted above, which belongs in thought to the chapter before it, the narrative proceeds in another direction:

Agricola xx. 2 (3-6): *sed ubi aestas advenit, contracto exercitu multus in agmine, laudare modestiam, disiectos coërcere; loca castris ipse capere, aestuaria ac silvas ipse praetemptare.*

Then follows the passage in which the phrase under discussion occurs. *Irritamenta pacis* has a special significance in this setting. Repeatedly by raids upon their lands and homes he terrorized the Britons, and then by a cessation of hostilities he arrayed before them

¹ Cf. *ibid.* xix. 1 (3): *causas bellorum statuit excidere.*

² *Ibid.* xx. 1 (2-3): *paci . . . quae vel incuria vel intolerantia priorum haud minus quam bellum timebatur.*

³ *Ibid.* (1-2). Hutton's rendering, in the Loeb series, "he cast a halo over such days of peace," does not reproduce the effect of the Latin. *Circumdo* is often used in Seneca with an abstraction represented as a protecting force or wall thrown around a person or personified quality, e.g., *studia tibi velut munimenta animi circumda* (*Dial.* xii. 18. 1); *philosophia nobis circumdanda est; inexpugnabilis est murus* (*Epistulae* xi. 3. 5). Tacitus alone uses *circumdo* with *fama*: *qui principatus inanem ei famam circumdarent* (*Historiae* iv. 11. 14). Cf. also *Dialogus de orat.* xxxvii. 28. It is clear that the phraseology in the present instance is purposely military and in conformity with the tone of the chapter which it heads. And besides, the emphasis is here upon the fact that Agricola rescued peace from ill repute and only incidentally upon the attractiveness of the new peace.

(*ostentare*) the keen stimuli of peace. The enemy were given a respite that they might look at the results of war (cf. *subitis excursibus popularetur*), which were thus thrown into relief, a respite disturbed, however, by constant fear of attack. Was Agricola by this procedure inviting the Britons to submission, presenting the allurements of peace, or was he provoking in them a compelling desire to live in peace with the Romans?¹

The third item in Agricola's peace program is presented in the succeeding chapter of the biography, and consisted of the establishment of the institutions of peace. That this was to be an active peace is evident, for Tacitus says of Agricola: *hortari privatim, adiuvare publice, ut templa fora domos extruerent, laudando promptos, castigando segnis*.² The chapter is a résumé of his efforts for the promotion of Roman culture and civilization during the seven years of his administration, though it is put in the form of one winter's program. The closing sentences reflect the personal attitude of Tacitus, as happens in a number of cases in the biography.

Agricola xxi. 3 (10-12): paulatimque discessum ad delenimenta vitiorum, porticus et balinea et conviviorum elegantiam. idque apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur, cum pars servitutis esset.

To associate this characterization of peace with the military movements which are related in chapter xx seems awkward and also indicative of an indifference to the trend of Tacitus' writing at this point.

Standing beside the requirement of suitability of thought, the rhetorical qualities of a reading ascribed to Tacitus demand consideration. The phrase under discussion invites the suggestion that he had in mind here a certain alliterative effect. Gudeman writes regarding Tacitus' use of this device: "Kein lateinischer Prosaschriftsteller vor den archaisierenden Autoren Apuleius und Fronto bedient sich dieses Mittels mit solcher Vorliebe und zwar in allen seinen Werken vom Dialogus an, wie Tacitus."³ From this standpoint, *parcendo rursus irritamenta pacis* plainly has an obvious advantage over *parcendo rursus invilamenta pacis*.⁴

¹ Cf. Vergil *Aeneid* vi. 852: *pacisque inponere morem*. ² *Agricola* xxi. 1 (3-5).

³ A. Gudeman, *Tacitus, Germania* (Berlin, 1916), Einleit., p. 42.

⁴ Cf. Tacitus *Historiae* i. 84. 11: *virtutis vestrae regimen relinquit*. C. Brakman I. f. discusses Tacitus' use of alliteration in "Tacitea I. De Clausula," *Mnemosyne*, LIII (N.S., 1925), 177-200.

Irritamenta pacis is far from commonplace. It is a vigorous expression, which presents a striking juxtaposition of contrasting concepts and is at the same time peculiarly effective in its setting both as to thought and sound. That Tacitus chose this phrase with discrimination is highly probable. No convincing reason is yet patent for dislodging it from the text in favor of the conjectural *invitamenta pacis*.

II

Agricola xxi. 1 (1): sequens hiems saluberrimis consiliis *absumpta*.

The manuscript reading, *adsumpta*, has been rejected by practically all editors, and *absumpta*, the proposal of Rhenanus, put in its place. Professor Stuart, after noting the reading of the Iesi manuscript, has retained *adsumpta*, which he interprets, "appropriated for." Among the more recent editions of the *Agricola*, his stands alone in the adoption of this form.

Absumpta has been easily accepted as a correction because it is the regular word in temporal expressions, and because it may function as a synonym of *insumpta*, which occurs in the heading of chapter xxiii, *quarta aetas obtinendis quae percucurrerat insumpta*, likewise a general statement of the way in which the time of a season was spent. The common confusion of *ab* and *ad* in the manuscripts is, of course, a factor to be taken into consideration.

But several reasons for refusing to alter the manuscript at this point present themselves. There is evidence for the belief that *adsumpta* is quite appropriate in temporal expressions, and particularly when there is the notion of an additional or unusual expenditure of time. An instructive example of the use of *adsumo* in this connection is furnished by Cicero in a letter to M. Fadius Gallus at the close of which he urges his friend to push on at his task of writing:

Cicero *Ad familiares* vii. 25. 2: urge igitur nec transversum unguem, quod aiunt, a stilo: is enim est dicendi opifex. atque equidem aliquantum iam etiam noctis *adsumo*.

There is apparently no question of text here. In view of this passage it is well to hesitate before some of the "corrections" that have been made in the texts of other authors. In the Medicean manuscript of the *Historiae* of Tacitus the following occurs:

Tacitus *Historiae* ii. 21. 13: ceterum multo suorum cruore pulsus Caecina, et nox parandis operibus *adsumpta*.

Halm, following the emendation of Muretus, reads *absumpta* here, as do most of the editors.¹ But, as has been shown by the Ciceronian passage, there is clear evidence for the use of *adsumo* in such a context. Tyrrell and Purser explain in their note to this letter of Cicero that the Romans seldom worked at night. Therefore such phrases carry the notion of an additional or unusual expenditure of time for the accomplishment of some aim.² Spooner, in his note on the passage from the *Histories*, remarks that the manuscript *adsumpta* "might mean 'was spent in addition to the day.'"³ It seems probable that the intended effect in this case is closer to the English, "and even the night was spent in preparing works," which would place the emphasis on the unusual industry of the workers. The fervor with which preparations for the battle were made by the Vitellians, on the one hand, and the followers of Otho, on the other, is vividly portrayed in the subsequent description.

Strikingly similar to the Tacitean expression is one from Ammianus. It likewise has been "emended" so as to read *absumpta*. Codex Vaticanus 1873 reads *adsumpta*.

Ammianus xxxi. 15. 6: verum introire auso, qui missus est, per Christianum quendam portatis scriptis et recitatis, utque decebat contemplatis, parandis operibus dies et nox omnis absumpta (adsumpta V).⁴

And again a busy scene is described: the people blocking up the gates with huge stones, strengthening weak places in the walls, setting engines to hurl javelins or stones, and bringing in a supply of water to last during the defense of the city.

The chapter of the *Agricola* which is headed by the sentence furnishing the text of this note is the last of a series of three setting forth the three phases of Agricola's program for the promotion of peace. The first winter of his governorship, as has been noted above, was given over to administrative measures useful for removing the primary sources of rebellion, the summer to a number of provocative

¹ *Adsumo* appears also in the manuscripts of Tacitus *Annales* v. 7. 2 in a temporal expression. The lacuna, however, makes exact interpretation impossible.

² R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser, *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero* (London, 1897), V, 170. Vergil *Aeneid* viii. 411, *noctem addens operi*, is cited in this note as an illustration of the point.

³ W. A. Spooner, *Tacitus, Histories* (London, 1891).

⁴ Cf. Fr. Eyssenhardt, *Ammianus Marcellinus* (Berlin, 1871), *ad loc.* The difficulty in getting at evidence of such a nature is illustrated by this passage, for Gardhausen, in the Teubner text, does not report the reading of the Vatican manuscript.

raids on British territory, disciplinary and intended to further the cause of peace. He had also established forts for the protection of the tribes that had yielded under the stress of these attacks.

In his second winter, as well as in his first, Agricola devoted himself to the interests and well-being of the provincials, initiating at this time a policy of Romanization which had for its purpose the development of a civilized town life on the island. That these measures were to be thought of as a part of the peace program is clearly seen from the clause immediately following, *namque ut . . . quieti et otio . . . adsuescerent*.

It is well to consider the effect of an *absumpta* in this context. A verb in the sense of "wasted" commits Tacitus to an exceedingly harsh and dogmatic remark. To take *absumpta* as a synonym of *insumpta*, as that word is used in chapter xxiii, is to make of it a neutral expression, "spend," "use." The emphasis of the sentence would then fall entirely on *saluberrimis* as the point of departure for the narrative of the chapter. This does not seem a happy interpretation since Agricola's efforts of the first winter were likewise salutary measures.

Through *adsumpta* the narrative of this chapter is linked with the account of activities of the preceding season, which had a similar purpose, and attention is called to the intense energy and enthusiasm of Agricola for the cause of establishing the interests of the Empire in Britain.¹ "The following winter was also devoted to highly salutary measures."

III

Agricola xxiv. 2 (9-11): *solum caelumque et ingenia cultusque hominum haud multum a Britannia differunt; [in] melius aditus portusque per commercia et negotiatores cogniti*.

This passage occurs in Tacitus' description of Ireland. The manuscripts read *differunt in melius aditus*, etc.² The singular verb *differunt* with the heavy subject *solum caelumque et ingenia cultusque hominum* is hardly to be considered a possibility, though Wex, Kritz, Draeger, Ercole, and others reconciled themselves to it. It would be easier if the text were *ingenia et cultus*. Anderson's suggestion that a supra-

¹ Clarence W. Mendell, *Sentence Connection in Tacitus* (New Haven, 1911), pp. 113-16, finds compounds of *ad* frequently employed with a connective force in Tacitus, but compounds with *ab* very rarely.

² The stop after *differunt* seems to have been due to a correction of E made by a late hand. (See Anderson's *crit. app. ad loc.*)

script stroke over the *r* has been lost accounts for the error, especially since the shape of the letter *r* would make the stroke above it less noticeable than it would be in the case of most letters. The same phraseology was employed by Mela: *ingenia cultusque gentium differunt* (ii. 9).

In melius, however, presents a more serious problem, and the suggestions for its solution have been numerous. Some feel that there is a lacuna here; others recommend deletion. Some take *in melius* with *differunt* and others with *cogniti*. To read *in melius* with *differunt* is to force Tacitus to make a statement regarding the Irish that was utterly at variance with tradition.¹ The addition of *nec*, first proposed by Acidalius and favored by a number of the earlier editors as well as by Professor Stuart, seeks to obviate this difficulty. But *nec in melius* added to *haud multum* makes an exceedingly cumbersome modifier for *differunt*, and the result is an awkward expression of an opinion that was commonplace among those who described the two peoples. Also the effect of *nec in melius* placed after *differunt* is of a postscript to a period already complete.

In melius aditus portusque . . . cogniti would be a difficult expression. *In melius* is used with such verbs as *muto*, *inclino*, *flecto*, *reformat*, *dissentio*, or where a change of condition is clearly implied. Anderson rather doubtfully omits *in* and suggests that it might have arisen from a correction written over *differt*, which was added to the text by a copyist. He thinks that the expression "may then perhaps be taken to mean 'fairly well known.'" That Tacitus should use *melius cogniti* in this sense is extremely doubtful. With *melius* as a real comparative the sentence would seem to mean that the approaches, the harbors, of Ireland were better known than those of Britain, a statement for which there is no historical justification. The interpretation of Bährens, who took it to mean that the coast and harbors were better known than the country in general is clearly so forced as to be unacceptable.²

Furneaux felt that some words had been lost between *in* and *melius*. Those who have ventured to propose phrases for insertion have not found much favor for their creations. The most popular has been that of Halm. He followed an early conjecture of Ritter

¹ Cf. Strabo iv. 5. 4; Mela iii. 53.

² A. Bährens, *Miscellanea Critica* (Groningae, 1878), p. 149.

and introduced *interiora parum* into his text in this position. It must be admitted, however, that the gain for the text by such an interpolation is hardly commensurate with the severity of the remedy.

The case is one that yields best to surgical treatment. Wex and Andresen among others considered *in melius* a gloss. It remained for Gudeman to explain the presence of the gloss as the comment of some patriotic Irish scribe which was afterward incorporated into the text.¹

There is a passage in Mela which supplies striking confirmation of Gudeman's argument and has not been cited, so far as is known to the writer. Mela is also describing Ireland.

Mela iii. 53: cultores eius (Iuervnae) inconditi sunt et omnium virtutum ignari magis quam aliae gentes [aliquatenus tamen gnari], pietatis admodum expertes.

The bracketed phrase appears in manuscript A, but was removed by Vossius. In both cases the phrase has been awkwardly inserted after words expressing a comparison of the Irish with other people. That both are interpolations is very probable.²

Without *in melius* in the clause, the comment that Tacitus makes here regarding Ireland has the conventional character of the preceding sentence: *solum caelumque et ingenia cultusque hominum haud multum a Britannia differunt: aditus portusque per commercia et negotiatores cogniti.*

IV

Agricola xxviii. 2 (6-8): et uno† remigante suspectis duobus eoque interfectis, nondum vulgato rumore ut miraculum praevehebantur.

It will be recalled that this passage in the *Agricola* is a part of the account of the episode of the desertion of the Usipi, elsewhere called Usipites. It was truly a *magum ac memorabile facinus*,³ and Tacitus

¹ Ed., *ad loc.*

² Cf. F. W. Hall, *Companion to Classical Texts* (Oxford, 1913), p. 194. It is credible that the corruption in *nave prima* in the first sentence of the same chapter has a similar origin. The sentence heads the description of Ireland, and it may be true that *NAUE-PRIMA* was the confused outcome of an interlinear gloss, *IUVERNA*, with the *NA* of *NAUE* the result of dittography from *NO* in the preceding *ANNO* and *p* picked up from *expeditionum* above. *Naue prima* had a good appearance and therefore persisted in the text. It has been admitted that Mela's account of Ireland was tampered with. Every text critic is familiar with the frequent corruption of proper names in the manuscripts. A case in point is a *prima disputatione* (Tacitus *Dialogus de orat.* xxvii. 7), where Halm has accepted Vahlen's conjecture, *Apri disputatione*.

³ *Agricola* xxviii. 1 (2-3).

thoroughly enjoys the story in the telling. The cohort of the Usipi had been enrolled in Germany and had but recently been assigned to Agricola's army. After killing a centurion and some of their military instructors they seized three Liburnian galleys, forced pilots to board them, and put to sea. The narrative proceeds from this point as quoted above.

Whenever the Usipi landed along the coast for supplies, they had skirmishes with the islanders in which they were often victorious but at times defeated.¹ Finally they were reduced to the extremity of cannibalism (*ut infirmissimos suorum . . . vescerentur*).² The story continues thus: *atque ita circumvecti Britanniam, amissis per inscitiam regendi navibus, pro praedonibus habiti, primum a Suebis, mox a Frisiis intercepti sunt*.³ Some, taken captive and sold as slaves, finally reached the west bank of the Rhine and won fame for themselves by telling the story of their great adventure.⁴

Tacitus does not indulge in prosaic details to the extent of telling from what point the Usipi started, in what direction they went, or just how long their erratic journey was. It may be reasonably assumed, however, that they started on the west coast of Britain, probably near the Cumberland district, that they sailed north around Cape Wrath, then south in the waters east of Britain, ultimately reaching the Continent. The inference is that the voyage was a long one and abounding in interruptions (*cf. cum plerisque Britannorum . . . proelio congressi ac saepe victores, aliquando pulsi, . . . ad extremum inopiae venere* [xxviii. 3 (9-11)]).

The manuscript reading for the text of this note is *uno remigante*. Modern editors have generally considered this as corrupt, though Annibaldi (1917) prints it as a sound reading.

The items in Anderson's critical apparatus may be used to present a few of the more important of the vast number of suggestions that have been made regarding this puzzling passage:

Remigante *codd.*: remigrante *Put.*: renavigante Mützell (*Halm*): re-meante *Henrichsen*: refugo, ante *Urlichs*: retro remigante *Gudeman*: <re-gente> remigante(s) *W. R. Paton*: refugiente *Andresen olim*: denegante *J. Müller*.

¹ The text at this juncture contains another *locus vexatus*, for which Anderson's conjecture seems the best thus far proposed: *mox ad aquam atque utilia raptum ubi adpulissent*.

² *Agricola* xxviii. 3 (11).

³ *Ibid.* 4 (12-14).

⁴ *Ibid.* 5 (14-16).

Remigante, "rowing," with *uno*, which manifestly refers to one of the pilots, has no significance. A helmsman does not row. And *uno* can hardly be challenged in the presence of *tris* and *duobus*.

A number of the more favored proposals have been built upon the notion that one pilot got away and returned to land, e.g., *renavigante*, *refugiente*, *remigrante*, and Gudeman's *retro remigante*.¹ Tacitus expressly states that when they had sailed around Britain they lost their boats *per inscitiam regendi*. This does not force the conclusion that they had no pilot at the beginning of the voyage. Presumably the Usipi were just as ignorant of steering when they started on the cruise as they were later, and without a pilot they would have been more apt to be wrecked in the northern waters. Since the difficulty with their boats on account of their ignorance of steering occurred after they had covered a considerable distance, apparently near the close of their voyage, there is reason to believe that they had a pilot during the first part of their wanderings.² Whether he lived until the end does not matter so far as this part of the text is concerned.

The trend of much of the more recent comment is toward the assumption that two of the pilots were slain and that the third steered the three galleys, e.g., W. R. Paton's *uno regente remigantes*, which Stuart adopted, and Iliffe's *uno rem agente*.³ Hutton, in the Loeb series, employs the reading of Madvig and Döderlein: *uno regente*. Objection may be made to Paton's suggestion on the score of the harsh sound effect, also a fault in an earlier conjecture by Hasse, *uno remigium regente*. Iliffe's proposed reading, *uno rem agente*, is tidy, too much so perhaps. An investigation of Gerber and Greef's *Lexicon Taciteum* will show that Tacitus seldom employed *res* with neutral verbs, such as *ago*, *fero*, and *gero*, especially when not qualified by an adverb. Furthermore, viewed from the standpoint of style, this phrase appears flat in comparison with the concrete and picturesque details in which the narrative abounds.

¹ Anderson seems inclined to the belief that they had no pilot at the start, though he prints the manuscript reading with the sign of corruption. He cites Dio's account of the same incident in support of his attitude (cf. Dio lxvi. 20. 2).

² *Ut miraculum* would be sufficiently explained by the fact that there was but one pilot for the three ships.

³ W. R. Paton, "On Tacitus *Agricola* 28," *Classical Review*, XVI (1902), 283; J. H. Iliffe, "Tacitus, *Agricola* xxviii. 2," *Classical Review*, XLI (1927), 175 f.

The purpose of the present note is to offer *uno remigium gubernante* as a feasible reading for this passage. The conjecture assumes that *UIMGUBERN* in the preceding clause is responsible for the loss of *IUMGUBERN* here. The short lines of an uncial archetype would require frequent eye fixation, and the weary scribe, glancing above the line that he was copying, may have become confused by the similar collocation of letters in the two places.¹ The *remigante* that he wrote looked well, and copyists did not question it.

Gubernare with *remigium* has a peculiar propriety in this narrative because the safe progress of the three ships depended upon the attention of the several groups of oarsmen to the directions of the one pilot. *Remigium* as compared with a possible *naves* paints with one stroke a picture of the three sets of men at the oars, and is thus greatly superior in imagery.

No parallel passages can be cited. It was a situation without parallel. Two may be quoted, however, in which Tacitus later employed a similar collocation of words:

Tacitus *Annales* xii. 56. 7-9: ac tamen spatium amplexus ad *vim remigii, gubernantium artes, impetus navium et proelio solita*.

Tacitus *Historiae* v. 23. 9-11: Cerialis . . . derexit classem, numero imparem, usu *remigum, gubernatorum arte, navium magnitudine potiorum*.

Cicero did not hesitate to use cognate forms of *gubernare* within one period:

Cicero *Republica* i. 6: qui tranquillo mari gubernare se negent posse . . . iidem ad gubernacula se accessuros profiteantur . . .

Uno remigium gubernante is paleographically easy, peculiarly suitable to the context in thought, unusual in its phrasing, and rhythmically effective.²

¹ The occurrence close together of two such serious tangles in text as appear in this sentence and the one immediately following (cf. p. 387, n. 1) suggests the carelessness or fatigue of a copyist as the original cause of the errors.

A. E. Schoene, "Zu Tacitus *Agricola*," *Woch. f. kl. Phil.*, xxix (1912), 272-78, postulates for the *Agricola* an uncial archetype with lines from fifteen to seventeen letters in length.

² The cretic-trochee rhythm has been rated as third in popularity with Tacitus for his use in *clausulae*. See R. Ullman, "Les Clausules dans les discours de Salluste, Tite Live et Tacite," *Symbolae Osloenses*, III (1925), 65-75. For cretic-trochee endings in the *Agricola* the following may serve as examples: xxvii. 3 (7): *virtute se victos*; xxxi. 3 (13): *exercendis reservemur*. Obviously the phrase *remigium gubernante* is appropriate to the text in point of rhythm.

V

Agricola xxxi. 5 (17-21): Brigantes femina duce exurere coloniam, expugnare castra, ac nisi felicitas in socordiam vertisset, exuere iugum potuere: nos integri et indomiti et in libertatem, non in *paenitentiam* <bel-
laturi, primo statim congressu ostendamus, quos sibi Caledonia viros seposuerit.

The passage is a part of the impassioned speech of Calgacus, the Caledonian chieftain, summoning his countrymen to make a brave stand against the Romans. Commentators have decided, without due cause it would seem, that the phrase in *paenitentiam laturi* is corrupt. Yet no conjecture has found any very general approval. Some would change *paenitentiam*, others would delete *in* in both positions; but the center of critical comment is in *laturi*.

Wölfflin proposed *patientiam*, used of the Britons in xvi. 2 (8), in connection with a revolt, as the original of the *paenitentiam* of this passage, a conjecture which a number of editors accepted, including Halm, in the Teubner text.¹ But in the same chapter *paenitentia* is used of the Britons after the battle.² For that reason the latter word would certainly be a more appropriate basis of comparison with the present text. It should be observed too that *paenitentiam* in chapter xxxi is explained in its own context by the clause *nisi felicitas in socordiam vertisset*.³

The two proposals regarding *laturi* that appear in the editions with any frequency are *bellaturi* and *arma laturi*. The former was offered by Koch and accepted by Wölfflin, Draeger, Halm, Hedicke, Annibaldi, and others, including Anderson in his revision of the edition of Furneaux. The latter editor had written *laturi* with the sign of corruption. *Bellaturi* is not paleographically convincing, and, furthermore, it lacks interest. Among the proponents of *arma laturi*, the conjecture of Wex, have been Kritz, Gudeman, and Stuart. It seems more probable that a whole word was dropped than that one

¹ E. Wölfflin, "Jahresberichte-Tacitus," *Philologus*, XXVI (1868), 99.

² *Agricola* xvi. 3 (13).

³ Charles Knapp (*PAPA*, XXXIII [1902], 49-51) has called attention to the parallelism of ideas in the two parts of this period as a factor in the interpretation of the passage.

syllable of such a common word as *bello* should be lost. The phrase *in paenitentiam arma laturi* has idiomatic support in *ferre arma ad suum . . . servitium* (Tacitus *Annales* iv. 48. 16).

T. G. Tucker, writing in 1924, also suggested an addition to the phrase as a remedy.¹ His idea was that *rem* could easily have fallen out after *-tem*; thus Tacitus might have written *in libertatem rem non in paenitentiam laturi*. Both plans, to add *arma* and to add *rem*, are neat and eminently practical. But Tacitus did not care for everyday phrasing. And his practice offers little or no support to *rem ferre*, for, as has been pointed out above with reference to *rem agente*, he clearly avoids using *res* with colorless verbs.

Two recent offerings, which like *bellaturi* seek to correct *laturi*, should be noted: *in paenitentiam aemulaturi* of J. W. Borleffs and *in paenitentiam ituri* of G. Breithaupt.² The latter shows how *ituri* through the intermediate stage of *lturi* could have been corrupted to *laturi*. Examples from Seneca confirm the propriety of the idiom.³ In the closing sentence of the following chapter of the speech, a future participle again occurs and it chances to be *ituri*, likewise functioning as a grammatical modifier of the subject. It is a question whether a reading which involves such a repetition would be very acceptable.

It is of course a platitude of modern textual criticism that in the case of a reading which represents the consensus of all the manuscripts the burden of proof is thrown upon those who wish to make a change. Two American scholars have taken the position that the text of this passage is perfectly sound and can be interpreted as it stands.⁴ Professor DeWitt recognizes the highly poetic nature of this part of the discourse and sees in the pregnant use of *laturi* the notion of *natura fert*, "prone by nature." Professor Elmore stresses the strong tendency of Tacitus in the *Agricola* and the *Germania* toward

¹ T. G. Tucker, "Notes on the *Agricola*," *Classical Review*, XXXVIII (1924), 170.

² J. W. Ph. Borleffs, "Zu Tacitus," *Phil. Woch.*, XLVII (1927), 991-92; G. Breithaupt, "Zu Tacitus *Agricola* 31. 5," *ibid.*, p. 381.

³ Cf., e.g., Seneca *Epistulae* xv. 3. 70: (*omnia*) *honestius in servitute casura quam itura*; *ibid.* xx. 4. 4: *voluptates ituras in dolorem*.

⁴ N. W. DeWitt, "Three Passages of the *Agricola* of Tacitus," *Classical Journal*, XIII (1917-18), 373 f.; J. Elmore, "Three Notes on Tacitus' *Agricola*," *ibid.*, pp. 212 f.

an absolute use of verbs.¹ He feels that the omission of *arma* causes no misunderstanding, but really strengthens this part of the sentence.

There is another, slightly different approach to the interpretation of the sentence which has apparently not been noted. The omission of an object pronoun is characteristic of Tacitus.² A few examples of this Tacitean habit may serve to elucidate the passage under discussion.

Agricola xlii. 3(9): qui . . . audiit preces excusantis.³

Dialogus de orat. v. 2-3: faciam quod probi et moderati iudices solent, ut in iis cognitionibus excusent.⁴

Historiae ii. 94. 13-15: liberti principum conferre pro numero mancipiorum ut tributum iussi.

Ibid. iii. 21. 12: milites mixti per tenebras, ut fors tulerat.

Annales ii. 23. 14-15: postquam mutabat aestus eodemque quo ventus ferebat.⁵

Dialogus de orat. x. 20: cum natura tua in ipsam arcem eloquentiae ferat.⁶

Earlier editors were inclined to amend the last sentence quoted above by adding *te*.⁷ Gudeman, finding no difficulty here, explained the idiom as the equivalent of *natura tua . . . cursum teneat*.⁸ Meister would, by this token, add *nos* as the object of *laturi* in the *Agricola*.⁹ But the sentence is headed by an emphatic *nos* as subject,

¹ Elmore cites among other examples in the *Agricola*: xviii 1 (2): *transgressus*; xviii. 2 (5): *agentem*. To these may be added a case of *fero* from the *Annals*: *paenitentia patiens tulit (sc. sententiam) absolvi reum criminibus maiestatis* (i. 74. 22-23).

² Cf. Anderson, *op. cit.*, pp. 60 and 150.

³ Gudeman would understand *provinciam* here (*P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus* [Boston, 1894], p. 82).

⁴ Despite the manuscript reading, Gudeman inserts *se* on the ground that it is paleographically "so easy." He feels that Tacitus would have written *contiones excusent* had he omitted *se*. See his edition, *ad loc.* Halm also adds *se*; but Peter supports the absolute use.

⁵ This type of expression is of course common enough. Cf. Livy v. 28. 10: *via quae ferebat Verruginem*; Quintilian *Inst. orat.* x. 3. 7: *si feret flatus*; Caesar *Bell. Gall.* iii. 15. 3: *quo ventus ferebat*.

⁶ Other examples of *fero* without an object where the subject is a concept associated with the person involved are as follows: Quintilian *op. cit.* xi. 3. 113: *capite ad dextram ferente*; Livy i. 7. 6: *si forte eo vestigia ferrent*; Persius iii. 62: *quo pes ferat*.

⁷ Halm, Nipperdey, and Anderson adopted this reading after Acidalius.

⁸ *Op. cit.* p. 133.

⁹ R. Meister, "Zu Tacitus *Agricola*, c. 31 *fin.*," *Wiener Studien*, XLI (1919), 194-96.

and a repetition of the pronoun within the clause seems awkward from a stylistic point of view as well as unnecessary.

Nepos provides an interesting illustration of the absolute use of *fero*, which is much like that of Tacitus:

Nepos *Datames* iv. 8: quem procul conspiciens ad se ferentem pertimescit.

It is to be noted that in these examples of the use of *fero* emphasis upon the action of the verb gives way to emphasis upon the direction of that action, with a complete submergence of the unessential pronominal object. The clause from the *Agricola* may be interpreted, "who are going to carry on to liberty, not to regret for our action."¹

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

¹ The revised edition of A. Gudeman's *Tacitus, Agricola and Germania* (Boston, 1928), came to my hands after this article had been written. On the points under discussion the reading of the former edition has apparently not been changed, so that I have not found it necessary to revise my references to Professor Gudeman's work. I may quote from the later edition, however, his comment regarding T. G. Tucker's conjecture, *Libertatem rem . . . laturi* (Cf. p. 391 above): "*Rem (res) ferre*, with or without *in*, is certainly not Tacitean, nor, in fact, so far as I can ascertain, elsewhere found in Latin in a tropical sense. In any case, *res* is too weak and nondescript a word in the present context." (See *Critical Appendix*, *loc. cit.*)

ON APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES* i. 14-17

By B. E. PERRY

THE story of Socrates and Aristomenes is clearly and, for the most part, logically related, with the exception of certain passages that center around Aristomenes' dealings with the janitor. These scenes are strangely unconvincing; they leave the reader with a sense of bewilderment which he experiences often elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses*, and which is due nearly always to some sort of Apuleian interpolation into an otherwise plain story, or to awkward and poorly motivated combinations.¹ In the present instance I shall attempt to show that the main substance of i. 14-17, which is a unit by itself, did not belong in the original story of Aristomenes; and that its intrusion by Apuleius is responsible for a number of well-known *cruces* in this part of the text, chief among which are the speeches of the janitor (i. 15 and 17) and Aristomenes' apostrophe to the bed (i. 16).

The first thing that arouses suspicion—not perhaps in the mind of the casual reader, but in one familiar with Apuleian tendencies—is the soliloquy of Aristomenes in i. 14. As soon as the witches have departed he imagines himself arraigned in a law court on a charge of murder:

Cui videbor veri similia dicere proferens vera? "proclamares saltem suppetiatum, si resistere vir tantus mulieri nequibas; sub oculis tuis homo iugulatur, et siles? cur autem te simile latrocinium non peremit? cur saeva crudelitas vel propter indicium sceleris arbitro pepercit? ergo quoniam evasisti mortem, nunc illo redi." Haec identidem mecum replicabam, et nox ibat in diem.

Taken by itself this passage is more or less plausible at first sight, although it does not follow of necessity from anything that precedes, and it indicates a very premature despair on the part of Aristomenes. When, however, we allow for the fact that elsewhere in the *Meta-*

¹ In general, see my demonstrations in *TAPA*, LIV, 196 ff., also *ibid.*, LVII, 240 f.; for the Risus festival, *AJP*, XLVI, 253 ff.; for the story of Thelyphron, *Class. Phil.*, XXIV, 231 ff. The last two afford abundant illustration of the particular phenomenon in question, and are thoroughly typical of Apuleian method.

morphoses Apuleius shows a marked fondness for the dramatic aspect of trial scenes and forensic oratory,¹ that he often dwells upon the legal aspect of things when there is little or no occasion for it,² and that he is abnormally conscious of the danger of an innocent man's being condemned by means of circumstantial evidence³—when all this

¹ See the elaborate description of the trial at the Risus festival (*Met.* iii. 3-9), an episode which had no place in the Greek original (cf. p. 394, n. 1), and x. 7-11, which is likewise in all probability an Apuleian addition.

² Cf. *infra*, n. 3. There is very frequent reference to legal and official matters in the *Metamorphoses* and much legal terminology; see the passages cited by Helm in *Apulei opera* ii. 2 (pp. xii-xiii). A book has been written on the subject by F. Norden. As a typical instance we may cite *Met.* vi. 4, where Juno is constrained by the Roman laws against harboring runaway slaves.

³ On the morning of the Risus festival the innocent Lucius says to himself (iii. 1; cf. the words of Aristomenes, *supra*) "An mihi quisquam tam mitis tamque benivolus iudex obtinget, qui me . . . innocentem pronuntiare poterit?" . . . haec identidem mecum replicans fortunas meas heulabam." In vii. 1-2, one of the robbers describes in great detail the net of circumstantial evidence drawn around Lucius after the plundering of Milo's house by their band. This passage, of which there is no trace in the Greek epitome, has no bearing whatever on the action and probably did not stand in the original Luciad. Its effect on Lucius is entirely psychological and leads him to meditate on how often the innocent man is condemned, while the guilty is spared. In vii. 25-26 an innocent wayfarer, who has no other function in the story, is accused of murder owing to the suspicious circumstances with which he has been unavoidably surrounded; and in vii. 27 the mother of the boy who has been killed by the bear lays the blame on the ass in terms which recall the words of Aristomenes: "Cui tandem vel ineptissimo persuadere possis atrocitatem istam culpa carere, cum propugnare pedibus et arcere morsibus misello puero potueris?" etc. (Bürger shows good reason for believing that all of the incidents in vii. 24-28 have been added by Apuleius; see *De Lucio Patrensi*, pp. 43-44). Further, see ix. 10, "quam plerumque insontes periclitantur homines"; ix. 41, where the gardener is "framed" (contrary to the Greek version); x. 6 ff., where a son is falsely accused of murder; the harangue in x. 33 against corrupt judgments and the condemnation of innocents; iii. 29, where the ass fails to take advantage of a longed-for opportunity (not given him in the *Ovos*) of regaining his human form by eating roses, only because he fears that the robbers may kill him as being a magician, or that he may some day in the future be indicted on a charge of practicing magic (cf. *TAPA*, LIV, 215, for the bearing of this and similar passages on the date of the *Metamorphoses*). It is noteworthy, moreover, that Aristomenes' fear of the law is thrice repeated: in the passage at the beginning already quoted; in i. 19, when his companion is alive and active though apparently failing ("quis enim de duobus [comitum] alterum sine alterius noxa peremtum crederet?"); and again in the same chapter after Socrates has been buried. The last of these passages may well be reminiscent of the original ending, since it forms a natural sequence to the real death of Socrates, and neither delays the course of the story nor is given more prominence or consequence than its incidental nature warrants. If we assume that the pre-Apuleian narrative ended in this way, then we might infer that the two earlier passages in which Aristomenes describes his fear of the law were suggested by the original ending of the story. Similar anticipations and duplications of ideas or incidents are common in the *Metamorphoses*; see *TAPA*, LIV, 214-17.

is taken into account we have good reason to suspect, though we cannot prove thereby, that the meditations of Aristomenes on this occasion were invented by Apuleius rather than by someone else who related the story before him. This suspicion is confirmed and amounts to a practical certainty when we examine the subsequent actions which depend upon Aristomenes' meditations, and the manner in which these actions are described. Before discussing these passages, however, it should be noted that the basic circumstances under which Aristomenes becomes dismayed, soliloquizes, and determines to run away are scarcely adequate to motivate his course of action.

After the witches had left the room, the most natural thing for Aristomenes to do before he despaired of the situation was to verify his astounding impressions—to find out whether or not Socrates was really dead and whether he himself had not been dreaming. It is odd that he does nothing of this sort in spite of his thinking about the matter for some time. Instead of investigating, as we should expect him to do, he takes it for granted that his companion is dead and that his own status is necessarily that of a fugitive from the law. The inadequacy of this motivation is due to the fact that the story about the suicide in chapter 16, along with the motive for it here stated, does not belong in this setting but has been added from without. That, in the original story, Aristomenes actually conversed with Socrates immediately after the departure of the witches (thereby testing his own impressions and banishing his worst fears) is implied in the confused context of i. 15 which we shall consider presently.

Being obsessed with a premature dread of the law, Aristomenes decides to leave the inn before daybreak (*furtim evadere*), but is prevented from doing so by the janitor's refusal to open the door. The only function of this janitor in the story is to prevent Aristomenes' exit and thereby drive him to suicide. Accordingly, in the reconstruction of the original narrative, all three incidents (soliloquy, attempt to leave, and attempt at suicide), being inseparably connected in their substance, must stand or fall together. If one of them is found to be interpolated, the same conclusion must apply to the other two also. As a matter of fact, however, each of them independently betrays in one way or another its spurious nature. Concerning the first we have already spoken above. The second passage, in which the janitor

remonstrates with Aristomenes and will not let him leave, runs as follows (i. 15):

"Quid? tu," inquit, "ignoras latronibus infestari vias, qui hoc noctis iter incipis? nam etsi tu alicuius facinoris tibi conscius scilicet mori cupis, nos cucurbitae caput non habemus, ut pro te moriamur." "Non longe," inquam, "lux abest, et praeterea quid viatori de summa pauperie latrones auferre possunt? an ignoras, inepte, nudum nec a decem palaestritis despoliari posse?" ad haec ille marcidus et semisopitus in alterum latus evolutus: "unde autem," inquit, "scio, an convectore illo tuo, cum quo sero devorteras, iugulato fugae mandes praesidium?"

The absurdity of this dialogue is manifest. Why should the janitor, whose motives are plainly not altruistic, refuse to let his guest depart simply because there was danger on the road? Furthermore, what can he possibly mean by saying that even if Aristomenes is prepared to take a desperate risk yet he himself is unwilling to die for the other's sake? If Aristomenes is killed after he leaves the inn, what has that to do with the janitor's safety?¹ And, finally, how can Aristomenes hope to prevail upon the janitor to let him go forth by assuring him that it is almost dawn and that anyhow a poor man has nothing to fear from robbers since he has nothing to lose? This conversation means nothing so long as the janitor takes part in it; but if we substitute Socrates for the janitor every word at once becomes clear and intelligible. Aristomenes is trying to persuade his friend to depart with him *antelucio*, as he had proposed that they do on the night before (cf. i. 11), and as he was now all the more anxious to do after being terrified by the entrance of the witches. Socrates, however, is too sleepy and exhausted to get up (cf. *semisomnus*, *marcidus et semisopitus in alterum latus evolutus*, said of the janitor) and is alleging a very plausible excuse for not doing so. He had previously suffered disaster at the hands of highwaymen (i. 7) and had good reason to fear them. On the other hand, having remained unconscious during the

¹ The difficulty in this passage has already been briefly and correctly diagnosed by Leo and Helm, though they have not dealt with the context as a whole. Helm says (*op. cit.*, ii. 2 [p. xv]): "Inepte enim ianitorem iter recusare [i. 15], cum dicit 'ignoras . . . moriamur,' recte Fr. Leo cognovit; atqui verba 'nam . . . moriamur,' quae in comitem sive viatorem sive servum convenient, delere mihi non sani iudicii videtur esse. Ergo putandum est Apuleium mutavisse rem, verba retinuisse." Since Apuleius has allowed to stand in his text certain speeches and phrases, which clearly do not belong in the situations which he describes, we may infer with certainty that his story of Socrates and Aristomenes was based upon a written and not upon an oral source.

visit of the witches, he is not alarmed about them and hence does not have the motive for leaving hurriedly that Aristomenes has. The substance of the dialogue thus far (down to *unde autem*) has been retained from the original narrative, where it took place between Socrates and Aristomenes; and it has been retained simply because it appealed to Apuleius as picturesque and interesting for its own sake, and in spite of the fact that his interpolated janitor renders it absurd. There is only one speech in the story that is appropriate to the janitor's utterance, and even that is not very plausible. I refer to the words *unde autem . . . praesidium*, whereby, in order that Aristomenes may be frightened into suicide, the janitor is made to suggest, with little reason for doing so, that he is guilty of murder. On the other hand, the speech of the janitor in chapter 17 has again been transferred from the mouth of Socrates, as we shall presently see.

His early departure having been prevented by the janitor, Aristomenes now in great dismay returns to his room and proceeds to hang himself by means of a rope taken from the bed. Before tying the noose, however, he makes an elaborate invocation to the bed in terms which, as Helm observes, are strangely inappropriate and which have, in all probability, been transferred in the main from some entirely different context—a mime perhaps, or a burlesque love story, in which the lover's tragic attitude ends in a farce, as it often does, for example, in Petronius.¹ It was for the sake of introducing this piece of burlesque, which of itself betrays the fact that it comes from a different setting, that Apuleius ascribed a fear of the law to Aristomenes and brought in the janitor for the purpose of driving him to suicide. Nor is the apostrophe to the bed the only thing that indicates its external origin; Aristomenes proceeds to tie the rope to a beam which projects on both sides beneath the window. Now a window would mean nothing to a despondent lover, but to Aristomenes, whose whole object had been to get away, it was salvation itself. He had turned to suicide as a last resort and only because he was unable to leave the inn. Presumably, however, he was quite able to make his

¹ Cf. Helm, *op. cit.* ii. 2, p. xv (I have lengthened his quotation from Apuleius): "Nec minus mira videtur quae sequitur [i. 16] Aristomenis lecti invocatio: 'iam iam grabattule, animo meo carissimo, qui mecum tot aerumnas exanclasti conscius et arbiter quae nocte gesta sunt'; ita enim lectum appellare videtur, non qui per unam noctem mutilo et putri et alieno, sed qui suo et semper eodem usus est. Sed non satis perspicio, qua ex condicione rerum haec possint sumpta esse, quae certe ad amantis animum tristem multo magis quadrent."

exit by this window, or at least to try it; and he could have done so in the beginning without consulting the janitor at all. In short, the mention of a window is a contradiction of the whole situation. Whether Apuleius retained this from the story of the lover's suicide that he has interpolated or whether he carelessly added it out of his own fancy cannot of course be determined. A passage at the end of the episode that we have been considering is still more decisive and should put us on the right track for reconstructing the original narrative. When Aristomenes attempts to hang himself, the rope breaks and he falls down on Socrates, whereupon we read (i. 17): "et ecce in ipso momento ianitor introrumpit exerte clamitans: 'ubi es tu, qui alta nocte immodice festinabas et nunc stertis involutus?'" These words imply that a fairly long time has passed since the janitor has refused to let Aristomenes out, for there is a contrast between *alta nocte* and *nunc*. To all appearances, however (cf. i. 15-16), Aristomenes had proceeded to hang himself immediately after returning to his room. There is, therefore, a plain contradiction between the long interval of time implied by the words of the janitor and the short interval that has transpired since Aristomenes' altercation with him. Furthermore, the words *stertis involutus* are not at all applicable to Aristomenes' condition; and, quite apart from what he says, the janitor had no business on the scene. His entrance at this moment is a clumsy *tour de force* of which Apuleius shows himself very conscious when he makes Socrates suppose that the janitor broke in with an uproar for the purpose of stealing something!¹ Two questions are before us: Why is the janitor brought in here? And why are his words so irrelevant and untrue? In the first place, the janitor is introduced at this point for no other purpose than to bear witness to the innocence of Aristomenes by being on hand when Socrates wakes up; he is made to be present in order that he may give Aristomenes the opportunity of exclaiming triumphantly *ecce ianitor*, etc., after which he is through functioning and disappears. Other business he has none; he is of no use in waking Socrates since that was already accomplished by the fall of Aristomenes; and, as we have seen, Apuleius himself tries in vain to give a plausible explanation of his intrusion. The words *ubi es tu . . .*

¹ *Met.* i. 17: "Non immerito stabularios hos omnes hospites detestantur. nam iste curiosus dum inopportune irrumpit—credo studio rapiendi aliquid—clamore vasto marcidum alioquin me altissimo somno excussit." Similar self-conscious apologies for false motivation are made by Apuleius elsewhere; cf. *Class. Phil.*, XXIV, 233 f.

stertis involutus must have been taken from the original narrative where they were addressed by Socrates to Aristomenes. If we give them back to Socrates they at once become intelligible, and they fall into line perfectly with the previous dialogue between the two friends (i. 15) as reconstructed above. A recapitulation of the presumable course of events in the original story will make everything clear:

As soon as the witches had departed, Aristomenes, alarmed and anxious to verify his impressions, roused Socrates and, finding him alive, tried to persuade him to leave the inn with him immediately and proceed on the way. Socrates, however, was too sleepy to get up and excused himself by alleging his fear of brigands on the road at that hour of night; Aristomenes (who had seen the witches) might be desperate enough to risk his own life in this fashion, but Socrates was not going to risk his by going with him; and so he went back to sleep. After this there was nothing for Aristomenes to do but to go to sleep likewise. He did so and was awakened in the morning by Socrates with the appropriately ironical words: "*Ubi es tu qui alta nocte immodice festinabas et nunc stertis involutus?*" Then Aristomenes rose up (the words *emergo laetus atque alacer* are reminiscent of his waking and rising) and expressed his readiness to leave (*quin imus*, etc.).

The foregoing reconstruction and interpretation accounts for all the chief difficulties between i. 14 and i. 17, including the two major *cruces* that appear in the speeches of the janitor. We have seen that all these difficulties are the result of an unskilful attempt to weave into the story a single episode that did not belong there, namely, the burlesque suicide described in chapter 16. The first step toward introducing this episode was to represent Aristomenes as fearing the law to the point of despair, but this fear was premature because Aristomenes had not even looked to see whether Socrates was dead; the second step was to introduce the janitor for the purpose of cutting off Aristomenes' escape, and that made the text of the dialogue in i. 15 for the most part completely unintelligible; and, as for the account of the suicide itself, it betrays its interpolated character in three different ways: by the apostrophe to the bed, by the mention of a window, and by the words of the janitor to Aristomenes (*stertis involutus*).

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

FOR THE RECORD

In his recently published memoirs, Professor Wilamowitz speaks of a matter which I should not have mentioned in print if he had not spoken first.¹ As it is, I feel justified in stating the simple facts. The Roosevelt exchange professor was expected, in addition to his public lectures, to offer a course in his own field. After my appointment in 1913, I received the, I presume, customary official letter from the University of Berlin asking me for the name of the course I proposed to give. I suggested Plato's *Republic*, which I had taught in American universities for twenty-five years. The surprising reply came that Professor Wilamowitz objected. Would I suggest another course? I proposed the odes of Pindar. Again I was told that Professor Wilamowitz objected. I then suggested Aristotle's *De anima*, to which no objection was made. Any irritation caused by this trifling episode was completely dispelled by the courtesy and kindness of my reception at the University of Berlin and the pleasantness of my sojourn there which I shall always gratefully remember.

Professor Wilamowitz' attribution to this source of my subsequent criticism of his books in reviews published in *Classical Philology* is fanciful. I had criticized him quite as freely before. And in some of the reviews that offend him I have since spoken more appreciatively of his brilliant scholarship than he ever speaks of anyone who has the misfortune to differ from him.² But he is unused to criticism, cannot bear or pardon it, and does not answer it even when it turns on the direct and definite issue of how a given Greek sentence is to be construed.

¹ (I quote not from the text, but from a letter.) *Erinnerungen*, p. 288: "Als der Professor Shorey bei uns über *Platon* lesen (lecture) wollte, bedeuteten wir ihm, dass dafür hinreichend gesorgt wäre. Das hat ihn mächtig verschnupft, und er hat sich durch die Versicherung gerächt, ich lasse jetzt meine alten Hefte drucken, und in meiner *Hellenistischen Dichtung* stünde nichts. Er muss es ja wissen."

² In the review of his *Hellenistische Dichtung* e.g. (*Class. Phil.*, XX, 75) the very sentence of which he complains continues, "In his case the notes [*Hefte*] are of course eminently worth while for specialists," and the statement that there was little that could not be learned from Susemihl, Couat, Croiset, Droysen, and Mahaffy was accompanied by two exceptions, one of which I said was perhaps a large exception. That is not quite *stünde nichts*. Again in my review of *Die Spürhunde des Sophokles*, written after the episode to which Professor Wilamowitz refers (*Class. Phil.*, IX, 99), I say, "The footnotes throughout this pregnant and suggestive paper teem with ideas which no student of the Greek Drama can afford to overlook."

As the readers of *Classical Philology* know, I do not regard courteously expressed specific criticism of what seem to me concrete errors in published work as either personal or in any sense offensive.¹

Professor Wilamowitz is a very great scholar. But he permits himself reckless assertions, makes many mistakes, which remain in his books uncorrected by laudatory reviewers, and has made too many unnecessary emendations which clutter up the *apparatus criticus* of editors who overawed by his reputation think it necessary to mention them. I see no reason why he should be immune from criticism. And when such criticism turns on perfectly definite points, the only adequate answer to it is to prove that he was right, or admit that he erred like other fallible mortals. I am of course not speaking of mere slips of the pen, but of errors on which an argument turns. Silence is confession, for it is too late by at least thirty years to take the ground that criticism emanating from Chicago is not worth mentioning. And there is, I believe, too much positive evidence of the use of Chicago work in his *Platon* to allow of the plea that he has not read it.

The examples of Professor Wilamowitz' errors that I have published are a small proportion of my store, but they are sufficient for the present purpose.²

The logic of Professor Wilamowitz' inference that my proposal to teach Plato's *Republic* (he had not published his *Platon* then) was an arrogant assumption that the University of Berlin could not supply its own instruction in Plato surely proves too much. It would apply equally to any author I could have named. The University of Berlin was of course entirely competent to teach any classic without the aid of a visiting professor. But when the visiting professor was three times officially requested to name his course what was he to do?

PAUL SHOREY

THE NAME "MARCUS ANTONIUS" IN *CIL*, VOLUME VI

In a recent article on "The Classical Roman Name in Historical Fiction"³ we find the statement:

Jerome Harte describes a banquet at the house of one Marcus Antonius Cato, also therein publishing ignorance of the very interesting commentary upon the record of Mark Antony, that, after his disgrace and fall the Antonia gens forbade the recurrence of the *praenomen* Marcus.

The source of this remarkable bit of erudition is unfortunately not stated. However, Johnston states that "the Antonii never used the name Marcus

¹ Cf. X, 486; VII, 91.

² Cf. e.g. "Solon's Trochaics to Phokos," *Class. Phil.*, VI, 218; *Iliad* xxii. 15; *ibid.* iv. 329; Menexenus 238 D; *ibid.* v. 361; Herod. i. 60; *ibid.* xv. 88; Plato *Protagoras* 336 D; *ibid.* xv. 200; Plato, *Theaetetus* 171 D; *ibid.* xvi. 127; Plato *Meno* 81 A; *ibid.* xviii. 353.

³ Frederic S. Dunn, *Classical Journal*, XXIV, No. 4 (January, 1929), 286.

after the downfall of the famous triumvir Marcus Antonius."¹ Huebner,² followed by Egbert,³ states that Marcus was not used by the *gens Antonia* after the downfall of the triumvir, and cites classical authors to prove it.

Upon investigation, Huebner's authorities do not quite carry the conviction we might have expected, for Dio merely says that the Romans "forbade any of his [i.e., the triumvir's] relatives to have the name Marcus."⁴ Plutarch reports that the senate "decreed that no Antony should have the name Marcus."⁵ And, finally, the statement of Tacitus that the name was on the consular *fasti* in the time of Tiberius seems entirely beside the point.⁶ From our ancient authorities, then, it is clear that nothing can rightly be inferred except that the senate⁷ decreed that there should be no recurrence of the name Marcus Antonius after the downfall of the triumvir. From this decree it seems customary in modern times to assume that the name was actually not used thereafter.

The epigraphic remains of course throw some light upon the frequency of the name. (For this paper those inscriptions which belong to the city of Rome have been used and will be cited in Vol. VI of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.)

The name Marcus Antonius is not uncommon among soldiers. It is found in 200 (five times); 1057 (three times); 1058 (three times); 25555; 2627; 2931; 3020; 3099; 3100; 3504; 32526; 32640.32 and 35.

Among freedmen the name is found in 4487; 6150; 9803; 10067; 11957; 11958; 11959; 11965*a, b*; 11974; 11988; 11999; 12004; 12008; 19234; 33389*a*; 33499; 34451. Presumably most of the *tituli* from the monuments of Livia and Marcella are those of freedmen. In 12033 and 34441, respectively, a *patronus* and *patrona* are mentioned which may imply that the M. Antonius providing the monument in each case is a freedman. Probably the gladiators (10194 and 10195) are freedmen too. The *faber* (9405. 5. 7—) and the quaestor's scribe (1805) may be free born.

A *stator Augusto* (32744), a "knight" (1591), and a man who has held all the offices in his home town (33887) represent the middle classes. Of the inscriptions of the senatorial order, all of which can be dated, only one (1343) contains a *cursus honorum*. There were two men by the name of Marcus Antonius who were consuls, two who were *sodales Augustalis Claudialis*, an Arval brother, and finally a boy whose father was of senatorial rank.

Besides these inscriptions which give more or less specific information about the social status of the Marcus Antonius which each of them mentions

¹ *Private Life of the Romans*, p. 38.

² *Römische Epigraphik*, in Müller's *Handbuch*, I (1892), 658.

³ *Latin Inscriptions*, p. 86.

⁵ *Cic.* 49.

⁴ i. 19.

⁶ *Ann.* iii. 18. 1.

⁷ There is mention of a (*decreto gentis*) decree of the tribe under similar circumstances in Cicero's *First Philippic* (xiii. 32) and cited by Daremberg-Saglio, *s.v. nomen*.

there are a number which do not and which cannot be dated from the *CIL*. They include the following: 690; 2590; 2710; 3080; 5568; 5654; 5769; 6720; 6914; 7522; 10330; 10361; 10362; 10363; 10661; 11950; 11954; 11961; 11962; 11964; 11968; 11975; 11976; (11978); 11981; 11983; 11984; 11985; 11986; 11987; 11989; 11991; 11992; 11993; 11994; 11996; 11997; 12000; 12001; 12003; 12007; 12912; 12020; 12021; 12028; 12040; 12058; 12059; 12060; 13414; 13529; 13751; 14672; 16814; 17243; 18528; 19062; 22143; 22517; 23677; 25200; 25531; 26576; 28170; 28974; 30982c; 33173; 33267; 34436; 34438; 34445; 34447; 34448; 34451; 34455; 33498; 36028.

The inscriptions which can be dated are those shown in the table.

TABLE

A.P.C.	Cognomen	Notabilia	<i>CIL</i> , Vol. VI
239.....	A/nus	<i>miles coh. vii vigilum</i>	3020
225.....	Fe...	<i>sodalis Augustalis Claudialis</i>	1984.39
210.....	M. f. Valens	On a basis dedicated by the fifth cohort of the <i>vigiles</i> to Caracalla	1058. in frag. 15 4.63 5.75
-210.....	Donatus Ianuarius	On the same basis as the foregoing but apparently inscribed a few years before it was set up	1057.5.27 7.27 7.91
210.....	Oronta	<i>sodalis Augustalis Claudialis</i>	1984.37
-211.....	... anus	<i>Pr. patricii auguris quaest.</i> , etc.	1343
197.....	Antius Lupus	<i>miles coh. xii urb.</i>	32526. a. 1.25
186.....	M. f. Valens	<i>frater arvalis</i>	2100. a. 12
-186.....	Iuvenis	(A peculiar mixture of Latin and Greek)	30764
183.....	Mega	(The same man as in a. 186 above)	2099. 1. 19; 2. 20
141.....	Iuvenis	A praetorian	32519. a. 2. 19
131.....	M. f. Proculus	Consul for the year	157. 2; 10299. 2. 7; 10048.6
Ca. 117....	Rufinus	A gladiator freed after the death of Trajan (Hirschfeld)	10194
118.....	Exochus	A boy of senatorial rank whose father and mother were both living	32374. 1. 54
105.....	.. us Pr. . us	Consul for the year	31141. b. 12
Saec. I....	Cocceianus		11954
Saec. I....	Aug. I		12011
70.....	M. f. Rufus	Discharged soldiers	200. 1. 17 2.3 5.14 6.10 6.14
	Glycus		8697
	Fortunatus		4054
	Apollonius		4056
	Verax		4239
	Tanais		4259
-68.....	Phoebus	From the monument of Livia the wife of Augustus; according to Mommsen, built in the latter part of the reign of Augustus and in use until the time of Claudius though some inscriptions (not any of these) may be later	4264 4265 4266
-54.....	Beryllus		4347
	Ismarus		
	Petorus		
	Anicetus		
	Demosthenes		
	Eros		
	Philonicus	Probably from the early years of Tiberius' reign	4485
-37.....	Apollonius	From the monument of Marcella the sister of Octavianus and wife of the triumvir M. Antonius; in use during the last years of Augustus and the first years of Tiberius, according to Mommsen	4486 4487
	Florus		4488
	Pindarus		4489
	Augustae I		4520
	Tertius		4521
	Thyrsus		4522
	Diomysus		4692
	Symmachus		4729
	Thiassus		4812
	Nicephor		33389. a
	Silvanus		12010
	Ingenus		
	Avus (?)		
	Iullus	Son of the triumvir?	

In conclusion we may note that in the *Index nominum* of Volume VI of the *CIL* are listed more than two hundred and fifty male members of the *gens Antonia* with *praenomina*. Of these more than 60 per cent have the *praenomen* Marcus. We have seen that, though less than a third of these inscriptions are dated in the *Corpus*, they range from the third century A.D. back to near the beginning of the first century; furthermore, we have seen the name Marcus Antonius used by all classes of society from freedmen (and slaves?) to consuls and Arval brethren. Obviously, then, if the name Marcus Antonius was suppressed at Rome at all it was for a short time and probably even then did not affect the lower strata of society.

SHARON LEA FINCH

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE *PERVIGILIUM VENERIS*

In section 1461b of his *Art of Poetry* Aristotle, in discussing the various difficulties that may arise in the interpretation of poetry, mentions the fault of which Glaucón speaks: *ὅτι ἓνα ἀλόγως προλαμβάνουσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ καταψηφισάμενοι συλλογίζονται, καὶ ὡς εἰρηκότες ὅτι δοκεῖ ἐπιτιμῶσιν, ἂν ἵπεναντίον ἢ τῇ αὐτῶν οἴησι.* This seems to me to have been the fate of the *Pervigilium Veneris* at the hands of most commentators who have attempted to date the poem and ascribe it to some particular author. For instance, it has been ascribed to Catullus¹ apparently for no other reason than that in T the *Epithalamium* of that poet precedes the *Pervigilium* by only a short interval; it has been ascribed to Apuleius² because of certain similarities in phraseology (e.g., *P.V.* 13: "ipsa gemmis purpurantem pinget annum floridis," and *Apul. Met.* x. 29: "quod ver in ipso ortus jam gemmulis floridis cuncta depingeret, etc."); it has been ascribed to Annius Florus³ because there are twenty-six verses extant under his name written in the same meter. There have been many other such attempts to define the authorship but the foregoing examples are quite sufficient to show the utter inadequacy of ascribing a poem to a particular author on the ground of one or at most two similarities in words or in meter without any further arguments and then being led to go into long explanations to account for peculiarities of language and meter that happen not to agree with the period in which the supposed author lived.

Now in 1928 the Dutch scholar Dr. C. Brakman⁴ published an edition of the *Pervigilium* containing a revised text based on a personal collation of the MSS together with a most lucid commentary in which he has put forward convincing arguments backed by irreproachable parallels for dating the poem.

¹ Bibliographical and other studies on the *Pervigilium Veneris* by C. Clementi (Oxford, 1913), p. 4.

² *Ibid.* (Oxford, 1911), p. 15.

³ Jo. C. Wernsdorf, *Poetae Latini Minores* (Altenburg, 1782), III, 450-53.

⁴ Dr. C. Brakman, *Jz., Pervigilium Veneris* (Leiden, 1928).

After reading through his edition carefully I found further evidence to support his case, and I would therefore begin with a summary of his arguments and then add what I think is a very probable solution of this thorny question.

In the first place, Dr. Brakman's text is the best I have seen for the following reasons: it keeps closer to the reading of the MSS than any other text; it keeps closer to the order of lines in the MSS than any other text; it is a logical unity and the sense of the poem is much more obvious in his text than in any other. However, it is not so much the various readings and the order of the lines I am concerned with here but rather the lucid and convincing arguments and parallels he puts forward for dating the poem. He points out that the characteristics of the language in which the *Pervigilium* is written are without exception those of literary Latin at the end of the fourth century. The following is a short summary of his main points:

The frequent use of the preposition *de* in the *Pervigilium* where we would expect a genitive, a simple ablative, or some other preposition (e.g., in ll. 4, 6, 10, 14, 17, 39, and 79). Such uses of *de* are characteristic of Late Latin; they point to the beginning of the transition period to the Romance languages (e.g., Fr. *de la vie*, etc.). The literary parallels quoted from other works of literature by Dr. Brakman are in each instance to be found in authors of the late fourth century—Prudentius, Ausonius, Sidonius Apollinaris, Claudian, etc.¹

The use of *vel* in the sense of *et* occurs in line 53 and elsewhere. Here again the parallels from literary works are to be found in Tiberianus, Prudentius, the Peregrinatio, Julius Valerius, Sidonius Apollinaris, etc.²

There are two or three words like *congrex* and *copulatrix* which are not found in works of literature before Ausonius, Prudentius, etc., but which become quite common in these writers. Obviously such words were in frequent use in the spoken language all through but were not admitted into literary works until the artificial literary language of the Augustan era began to yield to the stronger and more living expressions and words of spoken Latin throughout the Empire. It is worth mentioning that where the author of the *Pervigilium* uses *copulatrix* in reference to Venus, Catullus uses *conjugator* in exactly the same connection.³

Toti occurs in the sense of *omnes*—another characteristic of Late Latin and again anticipating the Romance languages (Fr. *tous*, etc.).⁴

The use of the present for the future as in lines 6, 7, 45, and 89. Students of Vulgar Latin know that this practice had long been common in the spoken

¹ Prud. *Contra Symm.* i. 185; *Apoth. praef.* 31; *Hamartig.* 212; Dittoch. (*Titul. hist.*) 136, etc.; Auson. *Prof.* xvi. 18. 7; *Cup. cruc.* xxiv. 1, etc.; *Epitaph.* xvii. 16. 2; Claud. *In Eutrop.* ii. (19). 35 (Birt, p. 94); *Paneg. de tert. cons. Honor.* vii. 25 (Birt, p. 142), etc.

² Prud. *Contra Symm.* ii. 94; Jul. Val. i. 88; i. 19; i. 21, etc.; Sidon. Apoll. ii. 12. 2; ix. 3. 5, etc.

³ *Hymen* lxi. 44.

⁴ *Toti—omnes* (Prud. *Perist.* ix. 11; Sidon. Apoll. x. 19, etc.).

language as is instanced by inscriptions, etc. Again it is just in Late Latin that we find this practice creeping into literary Latin.¹

In 393 Augustine wrote his *Psalmus contra partem Donati* and his *Abcarius Psalm* in acatelectic trochaic tetrameters without any attention to quantity. Now in the *Pervigilium*, line 72 and elsewhere, there occur metrical feet which, if judged by the standard of quantitative classical verse, are wrong but which can be at once explained if written at a time when the stress accent of spoken Latin was taking the place of the quantity of artificial Latin verse of three hundred years previously. Further, exactly the same mistake will be found in the works of Prudentius,² if judged in the old way. The prosody of the *Pervigilium* thus points to the end of the fourth century.

There is no need to quote further instances as they are many in number. Those already mentioned contain more and better arguments in favor of a definite period, namely, 370-400 A.D., than have ever been put forward by anyone else who attempted to date the poem. After reading through these and other linguistic arguments, which surely are sufficient to convince anyone who has studied the growth of Vulgar Latin and its effect on contemporary literature, I began to look through the poem for any references which might lead to further support, and I have found, I think, several. There can be no doubt that the last few lines are just what a poet who still adhered to the national pagan religion of Rome and looked back to its grand literary past would say at this period when Christianity had just received official recognition (312 A.D.), was gaining ground quickly, and when the various emperors, with the one exception of Julian, were supporting the new religion and doing their utmost to extirpate the old. It seems probable, then, that the author of these lines would be a pagan, one who revered the old national religion, and that in these lines he is mourning the decline of Roman religion and literature. Now it was just at this period that there was a pagan Roman reaction against the advance of Christianity together with an attempt to restore the vitality of Roman religion and literature. The families chiefly connected with this reaction were the Symmachi and the Nicomachi, both strong supporters of the old régime. On looking up information about these families, I found that the elder Nicomachus, who so tragically put an end to his life in 393 A.D., had been the chief protagonist during his lifetime of the national religion, had associated himself with every attempt to resuscitate the declining literature and the cult of the old gods, and had even himself set an example by writing *annales* which earned him the name of *historicus disertissimus*.³ Indeed, he was so active in support of the pagan Roman religion that Christian writers found it necessary to attack him in their publications and even to write poems definitely directed against him, as, for instance, the *Carmen adversus paganos* of Prudentius. He is reported to have been particularly

¹ Schmalz, *Lat. Gramm.*, sec. 222, and Plater and White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate* (Oxford, 1926), sec. 119.

² *Perist.* i. 3, etc.

³ *CIL*, VI, 1782 and 1783.

learned in the *disciplina* of the ancient augurs, and we read in Rufinus¹ and others that by means of this art he prophesied the victory of Eugenius over Theodosius and the decline of Christianity. Again it was he who persuaded Eugenius² to restore the altar of Victoria in the senate-house which had been removed by Valentinian II at the request of Ambrosius in spite of the efforts of Symmachus and his friends;³ it was he who petitioned for the restoration of the temple of Flora and the ancient cults of the gods. In fact, everything throughout his life, right down to his tragic suicide when supporting the cause of Eugenius against Theodosius, points to Nicomachus as just the type of man to compose a *Pervigilium Veneris* and the despairing cry at the end,

Illa cantat, nos tacemus. Quando ver venit meum?
Perdidi musam tacendo nec me Apollo respicit, etc.,

is just what one would expect from a traditional Roman of the old school who lived at a time when all that he held dear was gradually disappearing and making way for a new era.

But there is more than this. Symmachus tells us that the Nicomachi had estates in Sicily and that the son of the elder Nicomachus actually prepared his edition of Livy at Henna.⁴ Now the only local references in the *Pervigilium* are to Hybla and Henna, both of which are in Sicily. Further, the scene of the *Pervigilium* is in Sicily, and the detailed description of flowers and landscape is almost personal in its artistic touches and vivid colors. The question naturally arises: Why should Sicily be the scene chosen for celebrating a festival in honor of Venus? It is true that the worship of Venus was definitely connected with Sicily, but surely not more, perhaps a great deal less in the eyes of the average Roman, than many other places.

It seems to me that the date of the poem can be definitely put between 350 and 400 A.D. for the reasons mentioned above, and that the arguments which can be put forward for attributing it to Nicomachus are more and better than those that have been put forward for any other possible author. Certainly the authorship here suggested gives the most suitable historical background to the poem, explains all idiosyncrasies without exception both of language and of meter, and also provides the local atmosphere that best explains the wealth of imagery and vivid color in this swan song of pagan Roman literature.

WILLIAM ROLLO

CAPE TOWN

¹ *H.e.* xi. 33.

² Paulin. *Vit. Ambros.* 26 and elsewhere.

³ Seeck, *Symmachus*, p. lv.

⁴ Symmachus definitely states that the Nicomachi had property in Sicily and that the son revised his edition of Livy on his estate at Henna (iv. 71. 1).

PLATO AND THE STOIC *OIKEIOSIS* IN THE BERLIN
THEAETETUS COMMENTARY

The discussion of the relation of the Platonic ethics to the Stoic doctrine of *oikeiosis* in the fifth column of the Berlin *Theaetetus* commentary is of special interest to the historian of ethics. He will find there one of the very rare statements in antiquity of the flaw in the argument, the rift in the lute of a Benthamite utilitarianism. The utilitarianism of Plato's *Protagoras* so much admired by Grote and Mill is a calculating individual hedonism. Bentham tries to bridge the gap between this and a real ethics—to "save" justice or virtue in the terminology of the ancients by the formula "the greatest good of the greatest number." But the ethical nihilist will ask, "What have the greatest number; what has posterity done for me that I should sacrifice to it my personal pleasure?" and pause for a reply. How to answer him is the fundamental problem of modern and of ancient ethics.¹

The *Theaetetus* commentator, doubtless following older Academics, distinctly raises this question though with a different terminology. Neither the Epicurean nor the Stoic, he argues, can deduce, justify, or "save" virtue (justice) by their principles. The Epicureans obviously cannot. The Epicurean values even a friend, not for the friend's sake, but for his own. The Stoics try to evade this difficulty by the untranslatable word *oikeiosis*, which is the opposite of hostility, alienation, estrangement, indifference. We may call it the consciousness of kind and of kindness.² Every creature from birth is conscious of itself and feels self-love, a consciousness of kindness toward itself and all the parts and appurtenances of self. In man, however, reason extends this consciousness of kind and of kindness, this sense of kinship to others, and so self-love develops benevolence and justice. Very plausible, the Academics replied. But it will not stand the test of extreme cases and so save virtue unless the sense of kinship and kindness is absolute—unless the hundred per cent American cares as much³ for the ultimate Dago (*Μυσῶν ἰσχυατον*) as for himself and his own kind. And that is notoriously not the fact.

The Stoic device then breaks down in the testing cases which try an ethical philosophy. Hence, the commentator adds, Plato did not attempt to deduce virtue from this extension of sympathy to humanity, but referred it to his transcendental *τέλος*, the *ὁμοίωσις θεῷ*, that is, the approximation or assimilation of man as far as possible to a divine ideal. That of course is not, strictly speaking, the principle of the Platonic ethics, but only a restatement of it in the symbolic language of religion. The ultimate sanction for Plato as for

¹ Cf. *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology*, I, 214, and my *Unity of Plato's Thought*, p. 25, n. 163.

² Cf. *Plat. Def.* 413 B, *οικειότης ταύτου γένους κοινωνία*.

³ Cf. *Theaet.* 143 D, *ἐκδημόν*, with the commentators' comments.

Leslie Stephen in his *Science of Ethics*, as I have elsewhere shown,¹ is the analogy between health of body and health of soul. But it makes little difference, and the commentator is substantially right in the distinction he draws between Plato and the Stoics.

He subjoins, however, the statement that Plato anticipated the famous *oikeiosis* which he puts in the mouth not only of Socrates, but of the Sophists. In looking for the meaning of this I could find nothing more definite among Plato's many anticipations of Stoicism than his frequent use of *οἰκείος* as a synonym of good.

Plato does not use the word *οἰκείωσις* at all or the verb *οἰκείω* in the special Stoic sense, unless we are to count such passages as *Laws* 738 D, *καὶ φιλοφρονῶνται τε ἀλλήλους μετὰ θυσίων καὶ οἰκείωνται καὶ γνωρίζωσιν*. If the doctrine is to be found in Plato at all it must be inferred from passages in which he seems to pass from the individual's concern for himself to his participation in wider social activities. To this head might be reduced the many passages in which it is argued that a man must educate and reform himself before he attempts to reform society. The best for this purpose is *Rep.* 443 D ff. where the word *οἰκεῖα* occurs, with a distinct hint of its special meaning—*ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι τὰ οἰκεῖα εὖ θέμενον. . . . οὕτω δὲ πράττειν ἤδη*.

But where does Plato attribute this doctrine to the Sophists? Professor Karl Praechter in his article "Zum Platoniker Gaios," *Hermes*, LI (1916), 521, says: "Die Sophisten bei Platon sind Euthydemus und Dionysodorus, die Euthyd. 297 D ff. beweisen dass der Vater eines Menschen zugleich Vater aller Menschen ist." That is, I think, impossible. Not only is the word *οἰκείωσις* absent there, but there is no trace of the thought. There is no extension of the love of one's self and one's own to the love of others. There is nothing but a purely verbal fallacy.

I can discover nothing more plausible than the *Charmides* passage, 163 C–D. There Socrates says to Critias, "I was aware that by the *οἰκεῖα* you meant the good" (*καὶ γὰρ Προδίκου μυρία τινὰ ἀκήκοα περὶ ὀνομάτων διαιροῦντος*).² It seems not unlikely that Academic polemic treated this as an anticipation not only of the Stoic use of *οἰκείος* but of the whole doctrine of *οἰκείωσις* which Critias is represented as having learned from the Sophists, that is, from the Sophist Prodicus. If this is too far-fetched we might try to find the doctrine by implication in the account of the socializing moral education of the young in the myth of the *Protagoras*.³

PAUL SHOREY

¹ "The Idea of Good in Plato's *Republic*," *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology*, I, 194.

² Cf. *Lysis* 221 E and *Symp.* 205 E, *εἰ μὴ εἴ τις τὸ μὲν ἀγαθὸν οἰκεῖον καλεῖ καὶ ἑαυτοῦ, τὸ δὲ κακὸν ἀλλότριον*.

³ E.g., p. 325.

BOOK REVIEWS

Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe. Von R. REITZENSTEIN mit Beiträgen von L. TROJE. Leipzig und Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1929. Pp. viii+399.

Those who have followed the investigations of Professor Reitzenstein, particularly in recent years, will be prepared for the results which he reaches in this his latest study. They may be summed up in the formula that Christian baptism derives from Mandaeism, the baptism of John being an intermediary. According to this view, the Jewish baptism of proselytes had little, if any, relation to Christian baptism.

This bald statement, of course, utterly fails to suggest the wealth of research and erudition which we expect and find in this very stimulating and interesting book; but it formulates the thesis which the reviewer is bound above all things to consider. Though I have followed Reitzenstein, as always, with intense admiration, his argument leaves me in doubt regarding his main thesis. I grant that he has produced the best of reasons for holding that in the Mandaean rite of baptism we behold a type which explains Christian baptism, and that the confused and varied practice of the early church cannot reasonably be regarded as the source of the Mandaean; but it is difficult to assent to his view that the Mandaean sect was at the postulated date as strictly organized in ritual and doctrine as his argument presupposes. The Christian church required several centuries for the formulation of its vague doctrine and its uncertain practice of baptism, never quite definitely accepting a single specific interpretation of the rite. If we assume that John the Baptist was a contemporary of Jesus and baptized him as a Mandaean, or Nazarean, how are we to believe that the Mandaean sect, already existing and having a settled practice and interpretation of baptism, accepted John as its master and prophet? Furthermore, are we quite sure that the Jewish baptism of proselytes was as alien as Reitzenstein and others hold? The definite statements regarding the latter institution are, to be sure, of a character to give countenance to this view; but we have constantly to remind ourselves that Pharisaic Judaism, though it triumphed and dominated the later Synagogue, did not in the older time stand alone, but that numerous sects, about which we know little in detail, existed side by side with it. Pharisaic Judaism, like Catholic Christianity and official Islam, studied to simplify and normalize doctrine and cult-practice; and the fact that the baptism of proselytes is represented as colorless does not at all prove that it was always and in all Jewish sects of like character. We shall presently see that this was not the case. The Man-

daeans always associated their baptism with the Jordan, and their acknowledged connection with John suggests that the sect was originally Jewish. The violent hatred of the Jews displayed in Mandaean writings would perhaps suggest that the sect had been repudiated as heretical or had voluntarily withdrawn from the synagogue because of differences in belief and cultus. It could do so with the better conscience if the doctrines and cult-practices which it adopted were hallowed by age among certain bodies of Jews.

Baptism, whether that of the proselytes, of John, of the Mandaeans, of Mithraism, or of the Christian Church, is a rite of initiation—a *rite de passage*. Those who have at all gone into the subject of the *rites de passage* of the ancient world know how numerous were their occasions and how much they differed in detail, while the underlying conceptions were much the same. Though washing with water may not in ancient times have been as common as it is among certain moderns, it probably did not always have a ritual character. Nevertheless, it was ritually practiced on certain important occasions, such as birth, giving a name, passing at critical points in the life-cycle from one estate to another, at marriage, and at death, and in passing from season to season or from year to year. The rite signified and effected a death to the old and a rebirth to a new life, laying aside the old (including sin, τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν), and receiving the breath, or spirit, of life. That all these ideas were associated with *rites de passage* among the Hebrews can easily be shown: in *The Day of Yahweh* I have pointed this out in various connections. When Paul (I Cor. 10:1 ff.) speaks of passing through the (Red) Sea as the baptism of Israel, he is evidently repeating an ancient interpretation. The passage of the Red Sea, of the Jordan, of the Arnon, and of the Jabbok was certainly regarded as a sacred *rite de passage*, as I have elsewhere pointed out. To the cis-Jordanic Israelites the Jordan was the passover river par excellence, at which *rites de passage* of immemorial sanctity were performed. That these rites included baptism is a priori fairly certain, quite apart from the baptism of John, the washing of Naaman, who was converted to faith in the God of Israel, and the interesting incident of the passing of Elijah in the presence of Elisha at the Jordan. Except that baptism in the Jordan is not expressly mentioned (though both Elijah and Elisha pass through Jordan, as Israel passed through the sea, after dividing its waters, as Moses divided the Red Sea, Aaron divided the Jordan, and Jacob divided the Jabbok) the scene of Elisha's appointment as prophet in succession to Elijah strikingly parallels the details of the Mandaean rite of baptism. One can hardly resist the conclusion that baptism at the Jordan was an ancient *rite de passage*, interpreted, as it still is in Jewish and Christian thought, as a death and resurrection.

As for more specific associations of the Mandaean rite of baptism, they are mostly duplicated in Jewish tradition, which it were fantastic to derive from the Mandaeans. Professor Reitzenstein acknowledges his want of familiarity with the Hebrew tradition, and apparently many theologians who have discussed the history of baptism would do well to make the same con-

fession. My own knowledge of this vast field is woefully inadequate, but in *The Day of Yahweh* I have pointed out many things which, had he known them, might have saved Reitzenstein from making false points. Thus, when it is noted that John baptized with water, whereas Jesus was to baptize with the Spirit—whatever may have prompted the objection—there is no need to look to Mandaism for the association of ideas; because we know (see *The Day of Yahweh*, pp. 216 f.) that Jewish tradition called the *sukkah* (the booth of the Feast of Tabernacles) "the house of the drawing of water" because the Spirit was drawn from it. At that Feast were practiced rites of drawing water from the pool of Siloam and of sprinkling one another with water, and that water was interpreted by the Jews as Spirit. At the Feast of Tabernacles Jesus cried (John 7:37-39): "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him were to receive." Paul also (I Cor. 10:4) says, "They drank of the spiritual rock that followed them" (cf. I Cor. 12:13, πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν), clearly alluding to the Jewish tradition, which we learn from the Targums, that the waters of Meribah, associated in Jewish tradition with the Feast of Tabernacles, followed the Israelites until they passed over the Arnon. The illumination by the Spirit, which came to Jesus when he was baptized in the Jordan, and which is supposed to be given in Mandaean, as in Christian, baptism (φωτισμός), is evidently likewise a part of the Jewish tradition; for the lights of the Feast of Tabernacles were associated with the gift of the Holy Spirit (Shekinah), which in turn was intimately connected with the overshadowing *sukkah*. So, if Jesus taught, but did not baptize, the spiritual illumination could come to his followers in other ways. The eyes of the disciples were opened and they knew the Master in the breaking of bread at Emmaus, and as Jesus taught the blind recovered their sight. These things had definite connection with various ritual acts, such as the ἐποπτεία of various mysteries, and belonged to various rites of initiation performed at stated times, as the church clearly recognized in instituting the rite of *effeta* in connection with the reception of the competents for baptism. There is much in the Gospels to suggest that they originated in lectionaries (or their equivalent) for the sacred days of the Christian year, which for the most part duplicated the Jewish sacral year. Of course, at the beginning of our era, Jewish rites and beliefs had thoroughly assimilated much that was of foreign origin; but that fact makes it the more difficult to distinguish between Jewish and non-Jewish elements in Christian rite and doctrine.

One might consider at length the common observance of Sunday by Christians and Mandaeans, but it would lead us too far. There is sufficient evidence that this practice was not alien to Jewish notions entertained in certain groups. Even where one might suspect certain originality on the part of the Mandaeans, one may be at fault. Thus, Reitzenstein quotes (p. 337) from Mandaean liturgies the unwilling descent of the Sabbath-Spirit to earth:

the same motive is beautifully worked out in Jewish writings, which tell of the Torah, the daughter of God, descending reluctantly to dwell with men, like a king's daughter given in marriage to a distant prince. The Father, heart-broken at the loss of his daughter, follows her to earth. Perhaps the motive is common—I do not know; I cannot cite the precise Jewish source of the story, but I remember reading it many years ago in Weber's treatise on Talmudic theology. It contains, among other elements, the motive of the ritual refusal, still practiced in various lands by the would-be king.

In conclusion I would say that Reitzenstein has rendered an important service in pointing out the Mandaean parallels and in showing that the baptism of the Mandaeans cannot be derived from the Christian practice. In the absence of conclusive evidence it is hazardous, however, to maintain that the Mandaean sect antedates Christianity, though it is not improbable that it continued a practice of baptism long known to Jews and in conjunction with it adopted beliefs partly Jewish, partly of Iranian derivation, which were current in Palestine. We see in part only; and in the interest of truth and historical method we should not go beyond the evidence.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Lactantius and Milton. By KATHLEEN ELLEN HARTWELL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929. Pp. iv+220.

Before presenting the parallelisms in word and thought that form the main substance of her *Lactantius and Milton*, Miss Hartwell sketches the more difficult problem of Milton's general attitude toward the Church Fathers. Chapter i asserts that Milton is not to be lightly accused of disingenuousness (p. 13), whereas at times he clearly was so; it furthermore takes little account of his turns to fresh views under pressure of circumstance. Such factors, as well as the pulsing changes in religious thought during Milton's lifetime, made his attitude toward the Catholic tradition of less importance than his immediate purposes when using borrowed ideas. He shared somewhat in the vigorous investigation of Catholic claims to authority but was not long devoted to any controversial or scholarly position. He made his documents subsidiary to a main objective often far removed from their original aims, following his custom of seizing the nearest weapon for combat. Thus his attitude toward the Church Fathers is conditioned by his natural tendencies.

Continuing through the three remaining chapters and appendixes, one finds proof that Milton knew his way about when in pursuit of props for an argument. Entries in his *Commonplace Book* and bits from his prose demonstrate his discursive reading and bring forth a very few clear uses of Lactantius. Most of these are marked by direct references, but by matching Latinisms with original words Miss Hartwell has tied together other related ele-

ments. Her great caution in estimating final results is commendable. There is so little in the sieve after the shaking that no other attitude would be reasonable. Of the new points, that relating *Comus*, lines 463-69, to the seventh book of the *Divine Institutes* is the most valid and valuable. This has critical quality in making the patristic writings liable for Milton's stress upon fleshly lust as the cause for embodiment of the soul after death. Also, his outstanding word, "contagion," in metaphoric sense for sin, is led back to a religious origin in patristic documents. Another critical contribution of the book lies in a passing comment (p. 109) upon the God of *Paradise Lost* as being by no means the poet's final conception of God but only an unfortunate result of an error in using the Deity at all as a character in his epic. This is a good comment on Milton's way of mixing thought and feeling to the injury of both.

A point of some importance to Milton scholarship is brought out indirectly by Miss Hartwell's failure to find many critical investigations of the poet's borrowings from patristic writings. The cause is obvious to one who reads the English mind after 1688, then fairly well freed from its fears of Catholic dominance and ready to study modern religions and philosophies. The seventeenth-century controversial literature lay idle on the shelves. Scholars working in literary fields went in for classical sources or made English translations of Greek and Latin works for the eighteenth-century populace. A few partial studies similar to the present show a recent trend back to the documents actually used intensively by creative writers of Milton's day.

Miss Hartwell illustrates consistently the methods of close analysis used in demonstrating sources. Within a narrow field she has carried on the search thoroughly. Her conclusions are stated simply and without an emphasis to exaggerate their importance. More consideration should have been granted Fletcher's work with the rabbinical books, and more understanding of the cross-currents in Milton's thinking would have given generalizations upon the reasons for his borrowings. The values of the book grow out of a consistent application of analytic principles that make parallelism less deadly and study of thought transmission through the ages less a matter of chance.

DAVID H. STEVENS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique. By LOUIS SÉCHAN. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1926. Large 8°. Pp. 642.

This monumental work of Professor Séchan will prove of the utmost importance to the philologist as well as to the archaeologist. It is an exhaustive study of the vases which have any relation to the Greek theater and the dramas of the Greek tragedians. Based on the literary information and on a most detailed examination of the vases, the author was able to illustrate the existing dramas and, what is of greater importance, to sketch the plot of the

lost works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides especially. The importance of this work is self-evident. The author believes that already in the fifth century vase-painting was influenced by dramatic representations, but the majority of the vases on which his important conclusions are based date from the fourth century and were found in Southern Italy.

Aside from the pure literary conclusions, Professor Séchan gives a most valuable discussion of the south Italian vases, of the costumes worn by actors during the fifth and fourth centuries, and of the reasons which necessitated the omission of the face masks and the *cothurnus* from vase-paintings. The dating, however, of his vases is not very concrete, and in consequence the readers will find difficulty in following his chronological conclusions. The importance of the influence of painting on vase decoration is unduly minimized, and the influence of the local *φλύακες* on the theatrical representations disregarded. In general, all the evidence we possess today has been clearly and systematically treated and brought into relation with existing and lost works of the Greek tragedians. The footnotes and references included in this work are very numerous and form a real treasure-house of important information.

Vases are studied as objects of art, as a source from which is drawn a great part of our knowledge of the private life of ancient Greece and as a shadow-representative of the great painting. Professor Séchan's most valuable study of the vases opens a new path of research to students of literature and the ancient drama. It will remain a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί*.

GEORGE E. MYLONAS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Prehistoric Aigina. A History of the Island in the Bronze Age. By JAMES PENROSE HARLAND. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1925.

We possess such meager literature on the prehistoric age of Greece and Dr. Harland succeeds in presenting that period so clearly and scientifically at the same time that his work is always greeted with great enthusiasm by students of prehistory. Dr. Harland's conclusions, based upon a thorough exploration of Aegina, upon a scientific study of the remains in the little local museum, and upon a detailed examination of the myths and traditions woven around the island, are as follows:

Aegina was inhabited in the early Helladic period (ca. 2500-2000 B.C.) by non-Indo-European tribes akin to the tribes which introduced the bronze to the mainland of Greece. They worshiped a god Aigaios, after whose name the island was called Aigina and its inhabitants Aigaians.

About 2000 B.C. a new migration from the Peloponnesos brought to a sudden end the régime of the Aigaians. The new invaders, called by Dr.

Harland Minyans, belonged to the Indo-European homophyly and brought with them the worship of Poseidon. Their power lasted during the whole of the middle Helladic period (ca. 2000-1400 B.C., according to Dr. Harland).

The last invasion took place about 1400 B.C., and the new tribes which control the island now belong to the Indo-European homophyly and may be accepted as Achaïans. The end of their régime is not marked by a great catastrophe and probably took place about 1100 B.C.

The remains discovered at Aegina are so similar to those found in the Peloponnesos that the author is justified in accepting the same abrupt changes in the history of the island, caused by invasions, as those known in that of the mainland of Greece. But since we have a neolithic culture in the Argolid and Attica we cannot exclude the possibility of the existence of such culture in Aegina also (as the author seems to do on p. 6). The steatopygous figurine of the Thessalian type found in the valley of Vaghia probably dates from neolithic times, as figurines of this type were not in use in the Bronze Age, and therefore indicates that the island was inhabited during the Stone Age.

The theory of the god Aigaïos, after whom Aigina and the Aigian Sea were named, as the chief deity of the early Helladic people is very attractive, but we think that it does not accord with our present archaeological data. It is accepted that during the early Helladic period, Crete, the Cyclades, and the Peloponnesos were occupied by related tribes of non-Indo-European origin. At least in Crete these tribes were in possession of the eastern part of the island from neolithic times down to the eleventh century B.C. The great deity of the tribes in Crete was a mother-goddess worshiped from the Stone Age to the close of the Minoan era. The statuettes discovered at Zygyouries may indicate that a mother-goddess was worshiped in the Peloponnesos during the early Helladic period. Female statuettes also are usual in the Cyclades during the early Cycladic period, and some of them may represent a mother-goddess. We feel justified, therefore, in concluding that the chief deity of the tribes which occupied Crete, the Cyclades, and the Peloponnesos during the early Helladic period was a female goddess (maybe a prehistoric Aphrodite, mistress of the sea as well as of the land, from whose worship the cult of the historic Aphrodite evolved). Since the civilization of Aegina during the early Helladic period was similar to that of the Peloponnesos, the Cyclades, and Crete, we must expect that the chief deity of the island during this period was a goddess, the mother-goddess, and not a god, the god Aigaïos.

We accept without any reservations the position of the author that no Cretan colonization on the island of Aegina is justified by the present remains. His arguments on this matter are strong, convincing, and conclusive, and unless new evidence is obtained to prove the opposite his conclusions will be final. The author is to be commended on his efforts to present correctly the modern Greek place-names. We only noticed that Hagios Demetrios was spelled twice "Hagios Demetrias," on page 98 and on page 99—two of the

few typographical mistakes which doubtless will be corrected in the second edition of the work.

In concluding we may state that this work of Dr. Harland is an invaluable contribution to our knowledge of the prehistoric age of Greece and will prove an indispensable guidebook to the excavators of the island of Aegina. We only hope that the author will fulfil his promise and give us soon the remainder of his investigations which will bring the history of Aegina down to the present day.

GEORGE E. MYLONAS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Way of the Greeks. By F. R. EARP. Oxford University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, 1929.

This book adds another to the endless series of fairly readable, popular outlines, introductions, primers, résumés, handbooks, and sketches on the Greek spirit, Greek genius, Greek civilization, Greek life and thought, that are issuing from the post-bellum presses of England, Germany, France, and America. It is distinguished in the author's mind and Preface by the endeavor to find a juster mean between the extremes of superficiality and of pedantry, and by the emphasis laid on the ideas of the ordinary citizen as opposed to the ideals of the higher literature. But the attitude of the ordinary man has to be inferred from the literature which Mr. Earp selects as representing him—Xenophon, Lysias, and Aeschines rather than Plato, Sophocles, and Aeschylus. And so we get a chapter on Greek religion in which Plato is perfunctorily mentioned once and Matthew Arnold's four prophets of the imaginative reason are practically ignored.

Apart from the general unity of the point of view the fifteen chapters might be so many separate essays. Their titles are "The Power of Tradition in Greek Life"; "Sources of Evidence for the Traditional Greek View"; "The Tribal Nature of Greek Morality"; "The Contents of Morality"; "Religion"; "Sin"; "Future Life"; "Religion and Institutions"; "The Relation of Greece to the Savage"; "The Gods in Homer"; "The Dramatists"; "The Guilt of Oedipus"; "Language"; "Emotion in Art and Literature"; "Meaning of Words."

Among the points most emphasized by Mr. Earp is the fact that Greek literature, like Greek art, did not strain after originality, but tried to better traditional motives and types; the denial that the Greek art and literature are cold; and the overemphasis (in my opinion) on the unlikeness of the Greeks to us. The exaggeration of this last notion I have been saying for thirty years is one of the chief causes of the misinterpretation of Greek thought and literature. There is no use in saying that "for a modern reader to understand Homer's attitude toward religion is not easy" unless you add that Matthew Arnold, Swinburne, and Andrew Lang would prefer Homer's real religion to half the popular and traditional religion of today. And the attitude of modern

condescension which is a misapprehension even in the case of Homer becomes unspeakably ludicrous when assumed toward the calm and comprehensive intelligence of a Plato. However, it would be unfair to carp at Mr. Earp for not stemming the tide of prevailing fashion. And it must be accounted to him for righteousness that he revolts at Miss Jane Harrison's "There, I knew that Zeus was only that old snake" (p. 87).

But it is not necessary to bring in Plato and Sophocles and Homer to illustrate the persistent error of exaggerating the differences between us and the ancients. Here is a sentence intended to support the conclusion that the Greek code of morals differed from our own:

The Athenian gossips—and Athenians of both sexes liked scandal—would not whisper that so-and-so had been seen with a young woman who is no better than she should be—that was not scandalous enough—but they would whisper with equal satisfaction that his mother was in the green grocery line, and it is very doubtful if she is a true-born Athenian; or that he is mixed up with these disgusting foreign superstitions; that he associates with these atheistical philosophers, and as for his breeding, well, he does not know how to carry his *himation*; he hurries along the streets like a madman; he never goes to the gymnasia or hunts, to keep himself in condition as a gentleman should, but is flabby and pallid. "And, my dear boy, what can you expect? He drinks water!"

This list of offences against morals and propriety is drawn from actual instances; any scholar will recognize them.

Yes, any scholar will recognize them, but any critical scholar should also recognize that to bring them together in one sentence is the fallacy of the Upton Sinclair type of novel, and that an exactly parallel list could be compiled any time from the current literature of today. What, then, does it prove?

Again, he says (p. 53):

It explains how the charming, and in their way, bashful, boys and young men, with *αἰδώς* imprinted on their countenances, whom we meet in the pages of Plato or see in works of Art, could receive without a qualm jests that raise the hair of the most hardened modern.

This is just the style of Macaulay in the mid-Victorian age:

Buckhurst and Sedley, even in those wild orgies at the Cock in Bow Street . . . would never have dared to hold such discourse as passed between Socrates and Phaedrus on that fine summer day under the plane trees, etc. etc.

But it is meaningless for a generation in which young girls as well as boys read Joyce and Proust.

In order to preserve his originality Mr. Earp "deliberately refrained from consulting modern writers" about the Greeks. Such originality is indeed a fugitive and cloistered virtue akin to naïveté. If Mr. Earp had re-read only Professor Pearson's inaugural address as regius professor at Cambridge he could not have supposed that his slight chapter on language or his remarks on the meanings of *αἰδώς* were additions to the sum of human knowledge.

I am afraid that I have taken Mr. Earp's volume as a text or pretext to preach on some of my favorite hobbies. I have not meant to deny that he has made a readable and serviceable book that will interest those for whom it is intended.

PAUL SHOREY

Die Gesetze des Zaleukos und Charondas. By MAX MÜHL. Sonderdruck aus *Klio*, Band XXII. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1929.

This study, composed of two articles in *Klio*, takes up again the vexed question of the legislation of Zaleucus and Charondas, with special emphasis on the historicity of the two men and their work. The author in the first part of the study gives a survey of the older notices of the two lawgivers, comparing them with one another and weighing their probability in the light of the conditions under which the lawgivers lived. He accepts practically all of the older tradition. There is one notable exception. The graduated fines for neglect of jury duty, attributed to Charondas by Aristotle, must belong to a later, democratic period (p. 11). In the second part of the study the author examines the account of the lawgivers given by Diodorus and its reliability. He finds that Diodorus did not use the older writers as his sources, but followed post-Aristotelian sources written obviously with a moral and ethical purpose. The *Prooemia* in Stobaeus show considerable connection with the account of Diodorus. There follows an interesting chapter dealing with the scope and purpose of the work of the two lawgivers and its connection with constitutional legislation. In the final chapter the author collects the available evidence on the life and times of the lawgivers. The author's manuscript was completed just as an article by Adcock, "Literary Tradition and Early Greek Codemakers," appeared in the *Cambridge Historical Journal*, II, 95 ff. He finds himself in general in agreement with Adcock in so far as the two articles treat the same matters. Although Mühl's monograph adds little to the discussion of the problem of Zaleucus and Charondas it is interestingly written and gives a clear and usable résumé of the ancient evidence on the subject.

GERTRUDE SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Les Papyrus Bouriant. Par PAUL COLLART. Paris, 1926.

This edition of the Bouriant collection of papyri in the possession of the papyrological institute of the University of Paris is dedicated to Pierre Jouguet and maintains the high standard of scholarship which he has set in this field. The collection is a miscellaneous one containing sixty-three papyri of various kinds coming from different parts of Egypt and ranging in date from the second century B.C. to the sixth century after Christ. Forty-two of the papyri, including five that have been edited separately, are published in

full; the rest, owing to their fragmentary condition, admit of description only. Eight of the texts are literary; there are five private letters, and the rest are made up of public and private documents.

The literary texts include a schoolboy's notebook with exercises in writing and spelling from dictation (No. 1), a copy of Pss. 39-41 (No. 2), and an extensive fragment of a fifth-century homily (No. 3). Numbers 10-12 are letters, already well known, from Plato the epistrategos of Ptolemais dealing with the revolt in the Thebaid in 88 B.C. Number 15 is part of a series of contracts from the Arsinoite nome, called by the editor a "register" or *ἀναγραφὴ συμβολαίων*. However, the document bears a very close resemblance to P. Michigan Inv., No. 622 recto, from Tebtunis, and in all probability is like it an *εἰρόμενον* or chronological series of abstracts of contracts compiled in a grapheion (cf. *J.E.A.*, 1923, pp. 164-66; *Aegyptus*, VII, 97-107; *UPZ*, I, 612). Number 16 contains a series of abstracts of contracts affecting the property of a family of Oxyrhynchos between 97 and 198 A.D. In the Introduction to this text (p. 76), "Neron" is apparently a mistake for "Nerva." Number 20, the report of a trial before the Juridicus of Alexandria, is the same as Mitteis, *Chrestomathie*, No. 96. Number 25 is a touching letter of the fifth century written by an orphan Christian girl in Syrian (?) Apamea to her aunt at Koptos. But all the other texts are overshadowed in historical importance by No. 42, a roll of 2.20 meters in length, written on both sides, which contains reports addressed to the Strategos of the Arsinoite nome in 167 A.D. by the village secretary of Hieras Nesos and adjacent localities. The reports consist of a survey of the cultivated land according to its administrative and production categories accompanied by a notation of the public taxes due therefrom and of a partial list of tenant farmers with their holdings and the taxes assessed against them. These reports have been very carefully analyzed and interpreted by the editor (although his discussion of *γῆ ἀβροχός* on pp. 153-54 would have been clarified by reference to Schnebel's *Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Aegypten*), who points out what they contribute to our knowledge of agricultural conditions in the northern section of the Fayum.

Wherever feasible the texts have been translated, and the indexes are very complete. The clear type, the fine quality of the paper, and the four excellent plates combine to render this volume as attractive as it is scholarly.

A. E. R. BOAK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Greek Papyri in the Library of Cornell University. Edited with Translations and Notes by WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN and CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR. Pp. xx+287. 19 plates. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926. \$10.

This volume is a welcome first revelation of the resources of American papyrological collections, and Professors Westermann and Kraemer are to be

congratulated upon the excellent fashion in which they have carried out their work as editors. The publication includes fifty-five Greek texts of the Cornell collection and one (republished) belonging to the New York Historical Society. These are accompanied by translations, valuable interpretations, and commentaries, an excellent Bibliography, and very complete indexes. The nineteen plates give well-selected examples of Greek writing at various periods, although unfortunately the plate on page 241 is upside down. Several of these papyri have been published previously in various periodicals, and the editors have been able to profit by the criticisms and suggestions made upon these preliminary publications. Five of the texts are Ptolemaic; the rest belong to the Roman period up to 303 A.D. Of the Ptolemaic documents two certainly, and possibly a third, belong to the famous Zenon archive. The most important of these is No. 1, the long "Record of Lamp Oil" assigned to the retinue of Apollonius the diocetes in 256 B.C. Of the Roman documents the most interesting are No. 16, a census declaration by house-owners of Arsinoe (146/47 A.D.); No. 18, a declaration of children for registration; No. 19, a declaration of grain land for the census of 297 A.D.; No. 20, which comprises eleven columns of a long roll containing declarations of land for the census of 302 A.D.; No. 20a, the New York Historical Society's papyrus reinterpreted in the light of No. 20; No. 21, a *συντάξιμον* register of 25 A.D. which forms the basis of a calculation by the editors of the population of Philadelphia; and No. 22, a census list of the residents of Philadelphia domiciled in other villages. There are no literary texts.

In conclusion the reviewer feels that he must join in the regrets that have been expressed over the fact that the editors felt obliged from considerations of economy to adopt the method of photographing the pages of the book from a typewritten manuscript, and expresses the hope that it may be possible at some future date to print this volume in a more attractive form.

A. E. R. BOAK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

BREVIORA

[The managing editor establishes this subdepartment because of the difficulty of procuring substantial critical reviews of all books, and the impossibility if they were found of printing them in our limited space. It is believed that brief but fair *comptes rendus* will prove more useful than a mere biographical notice. Contributions to this department should never exceed a page, and a paragraph is preferable.]

The Negro in Greek and Roman Civilization. A Study of the Ethiopian Type. By GRACE HADLEY BEARDSLEY, PH.D. Pp. xii+145 and 246 illustrations. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1929. Price \$3.50.

The negro type was always rendered with the greatest realism in Greek art. It was barred from sculpture and the finer arts, but it was a great favorite with the potter, gem-cutter, and bronze-worker. Dr. Beardsley in this monograph proves that the type originated at Naucratis and that from this colony it was introduced into Athens toward the close of the sixth century. A *scarabaeus* from Aegina of Naucratis fabric is the earliest record of the type in the mainland of Greece in the historic period. At first the type had an apotropaic character, but later it was used for its comic possibilities. During the fifth century the type was used by the Attic potters as a plastic ornament on *oenochoi*, cups etc., and by the Attic vase-painters in connection with the representations of the myths of Memnon, Andromeda, and Busiris. The type was almost abandoned in the fourth century, but was revived again in Hellenistic and Roman times. Dr. Beardsley in a very systematic way describes the development of the type and gives an exhaustive list of works of art in the museums of Europe and America representing negroes. Among them are some unpublished vases discovered last year by Professor David M. Robinson in his excavations at Olynthus. The conclusion that the Athenians toward the close of the sixth century were familiar with the negro type can be accepted; but the evidence on which the existence of negro slaves in Athens during this period is based seems slight. The type was imported from Naucratis, and probably the Athenian artists copied well-known Egyptian models, as they later copied models of crocodiles. Very successful is the attribution to Charinus of some cups decorated plastically with negro and white faces. Dr. Beardsley's work is a valuable contribution to our archaeological knowledge and offers important material to the student of the private life of the ancient Athenians.

G. E. MYLONAS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Studien zu Martial. By OTTO WEINREICH. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928.

This volume is the fourth of the "Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft." Its subtitle, *Literarhistorische und religionsgeschichtliche Unter-*

suchungen, indicates its general nature. The first chapter, "Zum Buch der Schauspiele," consisting of some seventy large pages, contains much new commentary, involving much research, upon the Coliseum and the "Wonders of the World," upon the chronology of the epigrams in the *Liber spectaculorum*, and upon various myths therein employed by Martial. The second chapter, "Die Tiere und das Numen des Kaisers," discusses and parallels, in eighty-odd pages, the epigrammatist's examples of beast, bird, and fish astute enough to do homage to the emperor. A couple of appendixes, on Martial's Greek citations and on the relationship of *Epigram* ix. 31 to Juvenal's fourth satire, a few pages of supplementary notes, and a few more of indexes, complete a book that assembles a large amount of information and exhibits a great deal of scholarly zeal. It is undoubtedly difficult to invest "Studies" of this sort with the slightest literary charm, but Martial perhaps might wonder how any man who really loved him could bear to lose him in a forest of alphabetical and numerical captions.

BOWDOIN COLLEGE

PAUL NIXON

Papyrus Grecs de Lille. Publié sous la direction de PIERRE JOUGUET avec la collaboration de PAUL COLLART et JEAN LESQUIER. Tome I, fasc. IV. Paris, 1928.

This fascicule completes Volume I of the Lille papyri, which is devoted to texts of the Ptolemaic period and of which fascicules I, II, and III appeared during the years 1907-22. It contains no new texts but presents a lengthy list of additions and corrections to those published in the preceding parts. It includes also the indexes to these parts and twenty good plates illustrating the texts. The most interesting of these plates are Nos. I and II which give the recto and verso, respectively, of P. Lille 1, that important document which presents the diagram and description of the irrigation works carried out on the 10,000 aroura block of land near Philadelphia assigned to Apollonios, the finance minister of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and so ably treated in Professor Rostovtzeff's monograph, *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.*

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A. E. R. BOAK

Papyrusbriefe aus der frühesten Römerzeit. Herausgegeben von BROR OLSSON. Inaugural-Dissertation. Uppsala, 1925.

This is an exceptionally praiseworthy edition of papyrus texts. In a scholarly Introduction the editor analyzes the form and contents of the Greek letters from Egypt and makes a careful estimate of the Egyptian influences in Greek epistolography. The list of the letters numbers eighty. Excluding four that are dated between 100 and 110 A.D., all of these belong

to the period 30 B.C. to 100 A.D. and constitute a complete collection, except for unimportant fragments, of the published papyrus letters falling between these limits. The text of each letter is accompanied by a translation and an elaborate commentary. Where several letters belong to a particular archive, such as the Gemellus correspondence from Euhemeria, the series is provided with a special introduction. The commentaries are particularly valuable because of their copious citation of parallel passages and references and because of the new reading and interpretations which they suggest. There is hardly a single letter which has not been improved in one way or another over the original publication. For this reason Olsson's work is to be welcomed not merely as a convenient collection of epistolary texts but also as a revised edition of these which cannot be overlooked in the future. There is a good Bibliography and very satisfactory indexes.

A. E. R. BOAK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The Future of Greek Studies. An Inaugural Lecture. By D. S. ROBERTSON. Cambridge: University Press, 1929.

It seems only the other day that I reviewed the inaugural address of Professor Pearson¹ and here already is its successor. Professor Robertson glances at the history of this chair of which the first holder was Cheke, among whose successors were Porson and Dobree. But he begins his own survey with Jebb and the prelections held in competition for Jebb's chair. Of the five candidates three of the younger, Verrall, Adam, and Headlam, died within ten years of the death of Jebb. Headlam, Professor Robertson thinks, was the first Grecian of his generation. Verrall was brilliant and stimulating, but too often erratic and fanciful. Henry Jackson, who held the chair from 1906 until 1921, enjoyed one of those local, personal reputations which those who judge only by published work cannot understand. And so with some slight further characterization of Arthur Platt, William Ridgeway, and Pearson, Professor Robertson passes over to the titular theme of his lecture about which he discourses pleasantly and sensibly but says and perhaps could say nothing new. He concludes with a few words on the study of Pindar, his own special field.

PAUL SHOREY

Samuel Butler and the "Odyssey." By B. FARRINGTON. London: Jonathan Cape, 1929.

Mr. Farrington takes seriously the theory of Samuel Butler of Erewhon (i.e. οὐρανός of οὐδαιμόνι) that the *Odyssey* was written by one Miss Nausicaa of

¹ *Class. Phil.*, XVIII, 187.

Trapani, which I doubt if Butler did. He supports this fancy by some clever and ingenious arguments which it would be a pity for an unbeliever to spoil by an unsympathetic restatement. The fallacy lies in the assumption that a happy thought for which plausible things can be said is a demonstrated truth. I could not convince Mr. Farrington of this, and nobody else needs to be convinced. So I will merely add that he has written a readable and entertaining booklet, and I bear him no grudge if he has slightly misrepresented Longinus and broken Andrew Lang's beautiful sonnet on the rack of a caviling and literal-minded interpretation.

PAUL SHOREY

INDEX TO VOLUME XXIV

- abuse of books **93**
- ἀγροία, basis of tragic plot **40**
- A Greater than Napoleon: Scipio Africanus*, Hart **104**
- Agricola* of Tacitus **376 ff.**
- aiming weapons at the face **203**; a sign of valor **297**
- alba ligustra* **91**
- ambiguity of Catullus xlv. 8-9 **48 ff.**
- Ancient Sicyon, with a Prosopographia Sicyonia*, Skalet **98**
- Antigone*, Creon in **269**
- Antony, *de sua ebrietas* **133 ff.**; identification of, with Dionysus **134**
- Apollo and Athena in the *Rhesus* **204**; inactivity of in *Rhesus* **207**
- ἀπὸ τῆς μνήρης, meaning of **193**
- Apuleius, *Met.* ii. 30, discussed **93**; story of Thelyphron in **231 ff.**; *Met.* i. 14-17, discussed **394 ff.**
- A Revision of Athenian Tribute Lists, Part II*, Meritt and West **313**
- Argive alliance and Athenian calendar **239 ff.**
- arithmetical problems **321 ff.**
- Asconius on Cicero *Pro Scauro* 1 **292 ff.**
- Asteris-Thiaki **63**
- A Study of the "Mecretum,"* Douglas **318**
- asty*, seat of Lachares' government **15**
- Athena, contrast of, with Apollo in *Rhesus* **206**
- Athenian calendar and Argive alliance **239 ff.**
- Athens, captured in 295 B.C. **20**
- at*, origin and meaning of **169 ff.**
- Aus einer alten Etruskerstadt*, Poulsen **216**
- authorship of *Laus Pisonis* **109 ff.**
- Autobiography of Joseph Scaliger, with Autobiographical Selections from His Letters, His Testament, and the Funeral Orations* by Daniel Heinsius and Dominicus Baudius, trans. Robinson **97**
- Bacchides*, metrical arrangement of fragments of **197**
- Bellum Civile* of Petronius **69**
- blood, as possessing mystic qualities **144 ff.**
- boulé* in Cyrene **363**
- Braga-Chaves road **81**
- Callicles, mandate to, in *Trinummus* **185**
- Callimachus' *Coma Berenices*, new fragment of **290 ff.**
- Camino de la Plata **79**
- Cassander, death of **4**
- Catullus and Horace. Two Roman Poets in Their Environment*, Frank **100**
- Catullus, compared with new fragment of Callimachus **290**; fragment of at Leningrad, **294 ff.**; xlv. 8-9, ambiguity of **48 ff.**; xxxvi, interpretation of **176 ff.**
- causa salutis* **301**
- Charias and Lachares, conflict between **10**
- Chaucer and the Roman Poets*, Shannon **310**
- children, taboo **151**
- chronology of years 435-31 B.C. **217 ff.**; of the year 238 A.D. **285**
- Cicero, use of *at* by **171 ff.**; *Pro Scauro* 1, Asconius on **292 ff.**
- Cicero. Letters to His Friends*. Vol. II, Books vii-xii, trans. Williams **317**
- Cicero. The Verrine Orations*. Vol. I, trans. Greenwood **318**
- CIL*, Vol. VI, "Marcus Antonius" in **402 ff.**
- civiliter*, meaning of **89 f.**
- Coma Berenices* of Callimachus **290 ff.**

- comedy of errors **32 ff.**
conjuncta causa **300**; in rhetoric **302**;
 in law **303**
 Corinth and Coreyra, date of conflict
 between **217**
 corpses, considered dangerous **156**
 Creon of Sophocles **263 ff.**
 crowns of laurel, worn during thunder-
 storms **201 ff.**
 Cupid, double sneezing of, in Catullus
 xlv **48**
 Cyrene, constitutional inscription from
351 ff.
- Dacia: An Outline of the Early Civiliza-
 tions of the Carpatho-Danubian Coun-
 tries*, Párvan **209**
Daedalus and Thespiis, Vol. I, Miller
307
 date and authorship of *Pervigilium*
Veneris **405 ff.**
 Demetrius Poliorcetes, and Lachares
1 ff.; dates of reign of **20 ff.**
Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion,
 Schadewaldt **215**
*Die Antike Menschheitsidee in ihrer ge-
 schichtlichen Entwicklung*, Mühl **213**
Die Flüchtlingsfrage in Griechenland,
 Hadzopoulos **314**
Die Gesetze des Zaleukos und Charondas,
 Mühl **420**
Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe,
 Reitzenstein **411**
distictae membra poetriae **93**
 Domitius, attack of on Scaurus **292**
 Dulichium-Corfu **64**
- Eclagues of Vergil*, scholia on in Har-
 leian 2782 **274 ff.**
 Egyptian landowner of second century
 A.D. **42 ff.**
En Pays Romain, Cagnat **103**
epitasis **34**
 error as basis of plot of comedy **32 ff.**
Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses
rapports avec la céramique, Séchan
415
 Euripides, his dislike of Apollo **205**
 fishing, fragments of documents re-
 garding **164 ff.**
florilegia **111 ff.**
 forgery in Leningrad fragment of Ca-
 tullus **294 ff.**
Founders of the Middle Ages, Rand **208**
 fragment, of Callimachus' *Coma Bere-
 nices* **290 ff.**; of Catullus at Lenin-
 grad **294 ff.**; of Hippolytus, *πρὸς ἔδου*
346 ff.
 fragments of the *Bacchides*, metrical
 arrangement of **197**
- Gellius N.A. Praef. 13 **89**
 German verses on Leningrad fragment
 of Catullus **296**
 Greek and Roman law in Plautus'
Trinummus **183 ff.**
Greek Papyri in the Library of Cornell
University, ed. Westermann and
 Kraemer **421**
- Harleian 2782, scholia on Vergil's
Eclagues in **274 ff.**
Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age,
 Conway **317**
Hippias Major, logic and language of
369 ff.
 Hippolytus, so-called fragment of **346 ff.**
 Hoelscher, on the pedigree of Josephus
193
 Homer, quotations from, in Polyaeus
 1. Proem. 4-12 **330 ff.**
Horace on the Art of Poetry, Blakeney
107
 Hosius, on meaning of *virum civiliter*
eruditum **89**
- IG I²*, 96 and 302, discussed **239**
IG I², 296, discussed **221 ff.**
IG II², 1, 774, discussed **11**
Il Tramonto di una Civiltà, o La Fine
della Grecia Antica, Barbagallo **108**
 inscription, constitutional, of Cyrene
351 ff.
 interpretation of Catullus xxxvi **176 ff.**
Ion, shows Euripides' dislike of Apollo
205

- Ithaca, more problems about **60 ff.**;
299; description of in *Od.* ix. 21 ff.
299; identity of **61**
 Ithacan origins **335 ff.**
- Josephus, pedigree of **193**; claim of, to
 royal blood **193**
- knots, dangers of, in Roman religion
157
Kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen
 zu *Apollonios Rhodios*, Wifstrand **319**
- Lachares, and Demetrius Poliorcetes
 1 ff.; tyrant before death of Cassan-
 der **5**
Lactantius and Milton, Hartwell **414**
 laurel crown, worn by Tiberius during
 thunderstorm **201**
Laus Pisonis, text tradition and author-
 ship of **109 ff.**; text of **114 ff.**
 Leningrad fragment of Catullus **294 ff.**
 Lesbonicus, sale of estate by, in *Tri-*
nummus **196**
Les Papyrus Bouriant, Collart **420**
 Leucimne, battle of **219**
lex Domitia **292**
 lexicography of Merovingian charters
245 ff.
 logic and language of *Hippias Major*
369 ff.
 Longinus on the *Odyssey* **300**
 Lucan, as author of *Laus Pisonis* **131**
 "Lucanus in Catalecton" **113**
 Lucius Julius Serenus **42 ff.**
 Lucretius iii. 344-49, discussed **300**
- M. Aemilius Scaurus **292 ff.**
 "Marcus Antonius" in *CIL*, Vol. VI
402; frequency of **403**
 marriage arrangements in Plautus'
Trinummus **189**
 Melian expedition, date of **240**
 men, taboo **153**
 Merovingian charters, lexicography of
245 ff.
Met. i. 14-17, of Apuleius, discussed
394 ff.
- metrical arrangement of fragments of
Bacchides **197**
Much Ado about Nothing, ed. New-
 comer and Gray **315**
 nature of taboo **142 ff.**
 negative mana **143**
Neue Philologische Untersuchungen, Vol.
 V, Warburg **308**
New Chapters in the History of Greek
Literature, ed. Powell and Barber **305**
 numbering of poems in Leningrad frag-
 ment of Catullus **294**
- Octavian, propaganda of **133 ff.**
Odyssey, an epilogue to the *Iliad* **300**
Oedipus Tyrannus, Creon in **265**
oikeiosis, Stoic, **409 ff.**
On the Commonwealth, Marcus Tullius
 Cicero, trans. Sabine and Smith **315**
Orestes, shows Euripides' dislike of
 Apollo **205**
 origin and meaning of Latin *at*, **169 ff.**
 Oxyrhynchus, fragment of Callimachus
 from **290**
- Palladii Dialogus de Vita S. Joannis*
Chrysostomi, ed. Coleman-Norton **95**
 Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis **281 ff.**
Papyrusbriefe aus der frühesten Römer-
zeit, Olsson **424**
Papyrus Grecs de Lille, Jouguet, Col-
 lart, Lesquier **424**
Pap. Oxy., XVII. 2082 **1 ff.**
 P. Mich. 620 **321 ff.**
 pedigree of Josephus **193**
περί ἡδονῆς, fragment of Hippolytus on
346 ff.
Periceïromene of Menander **32 ff.**
Pervigilium Veneris, date and author-
 ship of **405 ff.**
 Petronius, Singrenius edition of 1523
68 ff.
Philippic, second, of Cicero, use of *at*
 in **171 ff.**
 Plato, *Timaeus* 38D, discussed **300**;
 and the Stoic *oikeiosis* in Berlin
Theaetetus commentary **409 ff.**

- Platons *Verhältnis zur Mathematik*, Demel **312**
- Plautus, fragments of *Bacchides* **197 ff.**;
Trinummus, Greek and Roman law in **183 ff.**
- Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xv. 135, discussed **201**
- Polyaenos 1. Proem. 4-12, quotations from Homer in **330 ff.**
- Pope S. Innocent I, Epistles of S. John Chrysostom to **279 ff.**
- Porphyrius, on Demetrius' reign **21**
- Potidaea **219**
- Prehistoric Aigina. A History of the Island in the Bronze Age*, Harland **416**
- propaganda of Octavian **133 ff.**
- proverbia, quoted in the Middle Ages, **90**
- P.S.I.* 798 **164**; text of **165**; translation of **166**
- Rabbinic parallels to *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* **258 ff.**
- repair of roads in Spain **77 ff.**
- Répertoire des Index et Lexiques d'Auteurs Latins*, Faider **319**
- Rhesus, Apollo and Athena in **204**
- roads in Spain, repair of **77 ff.**
- Roman landowners in Egypt **42 ff.**
- Roman life, survival of taboo in **142 ff.**
- Samuel Butler and the "Odyssey," Farington **425**
- S. John Chrysostom, correspondence of **279 ff.**
- Scholia in Thucydidem*, ed. Hude **106**
- Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, Rabbinic parallels to **258 ff.**
- Sicconis Polentoni Scriptorum Illustrum Latinae Linguae Libri XVIII*, ed. Ullman **211**
- Singrenius edition of Petronius of 1523 **68 ff.**
- Sophocles, Creon of **263 ff.**
- Statius, *Silvae*, *Thebaid*, *Achilleid*, trans. Mozley **318**
- stator Augusto* **403**
- Stoic *oikeiosis* **409 ff.**
- Studien zu Martial*, Weinreich **423**
- Suetonius, *Nero* ii. 1, discussed **292 ff.**;
case of Antony's propaganda in **140**
- taboo, survival of in Roman life **142 ff.**
- Tacitus, *Agricola* **376 ff.**
- taxes, receipts for **44**
- Taylor, correction by **300**
- text tradition of *Laus Pisonis* **109 ff.**
- Theaetetus* commentary, Plato and Stoic *oikeiosis* in **409 ff.**
- The Catullian Influence in English Lyric Poetry, circa 1600-1650*, Emperor **107**
- The Future of Greek Studies*, Robertson **425**
- Thelyphron, in Apuleius, *Met.* ii. 30 **93**; **231 ff.**
- The Negro in Greek and Roman Civilization*, Beardsley **423**
- The Two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 A.D.* by Otto, Bishop of Freising, trans. Mierow **102**
- The Way of the Greeks*, Earp **418**
- Thiaki, identified with Ithaca **61**
- thunder, use of laurel to avert **201**
- Tiberius, wore laurel crown during thunderstorm **201**
- titles of poems in Leningrad fragment of Catullus **295**
- Townsend, on chronology of year 238 A.D. **285 ff.**
- Trinummus*, Greek and Roman law in **183 ff.**
- ut ante* in Catullus xlv **49**
- vaccinia* **92**
- Vergil, scholia on *Eclogues* of **274 ff.**
- Via Augusta in Spain **77**
- Via Nova in Spain **82**
- virum civiliter eruditum* (Gellius *N.A.* Praef. 13) **89**
- weapons, aimed at face **203**; a sign of valor **297**
- Wilamowitz, criticism of **401**
- women, taboo **150**
- years 435-31 B.C., chronology of **217 ff.**

Two Dramatizations from Vergil

By FRANK JUSTUS MILLER

*Professor of Latin in the University
of Chicago*

Dido, the Phoenician Queen, and The Fall of Troy are two little dramas in English verse founded on the *Aeneid*. They are intended for presentation by high-school students and have been found well adapted to that end. They are also helpful as a supplement in the Vergil teacher's classroom. The volume is illustrated and contains stage directions, music, etc.

"An admirable setting of two of the many great ancient tragedies—Dido, the famous Phoenician Queen, and the fall of Troy. To dramatise such characters and events so as to make them instructive and at the same time attractive is confessedly difficult, but in this the author has eminently succeeded. Not the least interesting is the choice language in which the translation has been made."—*Journal of Education*.

\$1.00, postpaid \$1.10

The University of Chicago Press
Chicago · Illinois

REVISED EDITION TEACHING HIGH-SCHOOL LATIN

By JOSIAH B. GAME

*Professor of Ancient Languages, Florida State
College for Women*

A practical working manual for Latin teachers, prepared by a teacher of long experience in the high school, in the normal school, and in the college.

The first part of this book marks out definitely the function of Latin in the education of young people, and defines with exactness the work which the teachers of Latin in the high school must do. The ways and means by which these ends may be reached occupy the main body of the book. The latter part of this work is devoted to suggestions intended to add to the interest of the department. It is the only book of its kind—an actual working manual fitted to the needs of the high-school teacher.

\$2.00, postpaid \$2.10

The University of Chicago Press
Chicago · Illinois

THE DELPHIC MAXIMS IN LITERATURE

By ELIZA GREGORY WILKINS

Ἐγγόα, πάρα δ' ἄτη

Μηδὲν ἄγαν

Γράθι σεαυτὸν

Substantially all of the literature, ancient and modern, on these three maxims is summarized in Dr. Wilkins' book.

She considers their probable original meaning; man's perennial interest in them; the various experiences in life to which *Μηδὲν ἄγαν* has been applied; certain estimates of this maxim as a rule of conduct; the constant application of *Γράθι σεαυτὸν* to newly-arisen thought movements; various methods men have suggested for attaining self-knowledge.

\$3.00, postpaid \$3.10

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

The Development of Virgil's Art

By

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

Virgil the literary artist is too often forgotten in Virgil as a means of learning the Latin language. Here is a new interpretation of the great writer which indicates his position in the history of literature. Mr. Prescott applies to this classic of the ancient world the methods of modern critical appreciation.

"The book will be read with profit by teachers of Virgil, and can claim a legitimate place on the shelves of intelligent readers of literature who occasionally range into the ancient field."—*The Saturday Review of Literature.*

"He has done his task well and in an interesting manner. His book, in spite of its volume, is likely to find many a delighted reader not only among professional classicists, but also in the wider circle of those who care for the understanding of the foundations on which the great literature of Western civilization has been reared."—*New York Herald-Tribune.*

\$4.00, postpaid \$4.15

THE UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO PRESS

LAWYERS and LITI- GANTS in ANCIENT ATHENS

By ROBERT J. BONNER

Ever jealous of the expert, the Athenians tried to prevent the rise of a legal profession. But sycophants, speech-writers, and advocates—the earliest lawyers—plied their trade in spite of the restrictions. In modern times they have not had the study they deserve from historians. Their activities are here traced in clearer detail than ever before.

\$2.50, postpaid \$2.60

THE BUSINESS LIFE OF ANCIENT ATHENS

By GEORGE W. CALHOUN

Many aspects of the life of the ancient Athenian have been made familiar, but we know very little of the busy docks and markets in the Piraeus, or the industrial region around Laurium, almost modern in its dirtiness and desolation. Mr. Calhoun's exposition of the ancient Athenian's aims and ideals and standards of honesty emphasizes the beginning of the business standards that serve as a background to the commercial activities of the modern world.

\$2.00, postpaid \$2.10

THE UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO . . . ILLINOIS

